

# ENGLISH STUDIES.

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH  
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY.

Edited by

E. KRUISINGA and R. W. ZANDVOORT.

With a Supplement.

1926

VOLUME EIGHT

≡ Nos 1 - 6 ≡

Published by

Messrs. SWETS & ZEITLINGER, Keizersgracht, AMSTERDAM.

# CONTENTS.

	ARTICLES.	Page
W. VAN DOORN, _____,	H. POUTSMA . . . . .	65.
E. KRUISINGA, _____,	James Stephens . . . . .	1.
W. J. B. PIENAAR, _____,	How It Strikes a Contemporary. New Series. I . . . . .	129.
R. VOLBEDA,	How to Study Old English Syntax . . . . .	44.
	A Guide to English Studies. The Study of the History of English . . . . .	97.
	English Grammar as She is Taught at Oxford . . . . .	181.
	Edmund Spenser and Jonker Jan van der Noot . . . . .	33, 67.
	On the Place of Prepositions . . . . .	143, 169.
REVIEWS.		
E. R. ADAIR, _____,	The Fall of the Monasteries (Liljegren)	122.
A. BOSKER, J. L. CARDODO, W. VAN DOORN, _____, _____, _____, _____, O. DOUGHTY,	The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama (Cardozo) . . . . .	122.
W. P. FRIJLINCK, _____,	The Comparison of Inequality (Small) . .	81.
K. R. GALLAS, _____,	British Drama (Allardyce Nicoll) . .	120.
H. DE GROOT, C. B. VAN HAERINGEN, J. KOOISTRA, _____,	The Principles of English Metre (Egerton Smith) . . . . .	56.
	Principles of English Prosody (L. Aber- crombie) . . . . .	56.
	A Book of English Prosody (Sydney Grew) .	56.
	Walt Whitman (Bailey) . . . . .	193.
	Herman Melville (Freeman) . . . . .	194.
	The Dawn of Juvenile Literature in England (Andreae) . . . . .	126.
	Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama (Dugdale Sykes) . . . . .	19.
	Edward II; Philaster (trans. Decroos) .	85.
	J.-B.-A. Suard (Hunter) . . . . .	87.
	Othello in French (Gilman) . . . . .	124.
	Shakespeare: A Survey (E. K. Chambers)	54.
	Altfriesisches Wörterbuch (Holthausen) .	78.
	The Merchant of Venice (Ed. Quiller- Couch & Dover Wilson) . . . . .	156.
	The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library (Ed. Hill) . . . . .	159.

	Page	
E. KRUISINGA,	Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose (Sisam)	18.
, , , ,	A Middle English Vocabulary (Tolkien)	18.
, , , ,	The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's <i>Ayenbite of Inwyf</i> (Wallenberg) . . . . .	84.
, , , ,	Hexameron Anglice (ed. Crawford) . . . . .	119.
, , , ,	Alfreds Soliloquien des Augustinus (ed. Endter) . . . . .	119.
G. LEOPOLD,	A Cadger's Creel (ed. Douglas) . . . . .	88.
J. MANSION,	English Place Names in <i>-ing</i> (Ekwall) . . . . .	117.
, , , ,	Place-Names and History (Mawer) . . . . .	153.
, , , ,	Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names. I (Mawer & Stenton). II (Mawer) . . . . .	153.
H. J. VAN DER MEER,	The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire (Mawer & Stenton) . . . . .	153.
W. A. OVAÄ,	A Dictionary of Modern English Usage (Fowler) . . . . .	195.
, , , ,	The Death of Christopher Marlowe (Hotson) . . . . .	188.
FR. A. POMPEN,	About Shakespeare and his Plays (Bradby) . . . . .	189.
P. ROORDA,	Scentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra (Praz) . . . . .	24.
, , , ,	The Oral Method of Teaching Languages . . . . .	(Palmer)
, , , ,	English Through Actions . . . . .	
, , , ,	Colloquial English, Part I . . . . .	
, , , ,	English Intonation with Systematic Exercises . . . . .	
, , , ,	Everyday Sentences in Spoken English . . . . .	
, , , ,	A Grammar of Spoken English	
C. VAN SPAENDONCK,	George Meredith (Priestley) . . . . .	160.
, , , ,	The Writings and Life of George Meredith (Gretton) . . . . .	160.
W. H. STAVERMAN,	Daniël De Foe et ses Romans (Dottin) . . . . .	189.
A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH,	George Eliots Beziehungen zu Deutschland (Pfeiffer) . . . . .	27.
R. W. ZANDVOORT,	Wenken over het Samenstellen van Wetenschappelijke Geschriften (van Rijnberk) . . . . .	197.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## Current Letters and Philology.

1. Criticism and Biography (A.G.v.K.), 30; 2. Fiction (A.G.v.K.) 58.  
Points of Modern English Syntax . . . . . 51.

## Notes and News.

Sanki Ichikawa, English Studies in Japan, 105; Mario Praz, English Studies in Italy, 12; J. Vriend, "That alle myghtys may" in the Towneley <i>Secunda Pastorum</i> , 185.	
English Association in Holland, 51, 107, 152; A-Examen 1925, 17; American Linguistics, 18; B-Examen 1925, 49; The Teaching of Modern Languages in Holland, 76; Universiteit van Amsterdam, 77; F. P. H. Prick van Wely †, 107; Praktiese Opleiding van Taalleraaren, 187.	
Brief Mentions . . . . .	31, 60, 127, 199.
Bibliographies . . . . .	32, 60, 91, 164, 199.

---

# James Stephens.

## An Appreciation.

### I

The same old stolid hills and leas,  
The same old stupid patient trees,  
The same old ocean blue and green,  
The same sky cloudy or serene;  
The old two-dozen hours to run  
Between the settings of the sun,  
The old three hundred sixty-five  
Dull days to every year alive;  
Old stingy measure, weight and rule,  
No margin left to play the fool;  
The same old way of getting born  
Into it naked and forlorn,  
The same old way of creeping out  
Through death's low door for lean and stout;  
Same men with the old hungry needs,  
Puffed up with the old windy creeds;  
Old toil, old care, old worthless treasures,  
Old gnawing sorrows, swindling pleasures:  
The cards are shuffled to and fro,  
The hands may vary somewhat so,  
The dirty pack's the same we know  
Played with long thousand years ago;  
Played with and lost with still by Man, —  
Fate marked them ere the game began;  
I think the only thing that's strange  
Is our illusion as to change.

This is *not* by James Stephens; it is from 'Vane's Story', by that most unhappy man and true poet, James Thomson, the topographer of the City of Dreadful Night, self-styled Bysshe Vanolis<sup>1</sup>); and I put it here for the sake of contrast. I have stated elsewhere that of all modern poets known to me James Stephens is most like Browning's conception of Fra Lippo Lippi, and I still think the comparison as true as any, though it takes no account of the spiritual vein which, not to be found in the jolly friar-painter, runs very strong in the Irish poet. It is true the latter is hardly more of a Christian than Browning's saint-limning but life-worshipping pagan is. About his birth and upbringing I know nothing beyond what certain of his poems reveal; I never troubled to inquire, moreover I am fond of conjectures that admit of easy verification or disproval. My personal impression is that Stephens is of Protestant stock. For his speculations, however, for his philosophy of life, I think the term *Zoroastrian* would be aptest. But of that anon.

### II

I do not know whether 'Insurrections' has ever been reprinted. Stephens's other books have. 'The Crock of Gold' has run into as many as thirteen editions. But I doubt whether at this time of day it will be possible for a booklover to procure a copy of the little collection of poems that in 1909 drew their author, then a Dublin clerk, out of obscurity. The other day I saw in an American paper that a copy of it ('first edition') had fetched the not inconsiderable sum of twenty-five dollars at a New York sale, and

<sup>1</sup>) The first element of the pseudonym is Shelley's cognomen, the second is an anagram of *Novalis*.

it was a soothing and comforting thought to the present writer that he had bought 'Insurrections' at the published price of one shilling immediately on its appearance. I have it on my writing-table now, and glancing over the table of contents I am surprised to see quite a row of red pencil-marks, each indicating a poem that particularly struck me at the time.

Here is one, 'The Watcher':

A rose for a young head,  
A ring for a bride,  
Joy for the homestead  
Clean and wide —  
Who's that waiting  
In the rain outside?

A heart for an old friend,  
A hand for the new:  
Love can to earth lend  
Heaven's hue —  
Who's that standing  
In the silver dew?

A smile for the parting,  
A tear as they go,  
God's sweethearting  
Ends just so —  
Who's that watching  
Where the black winds blow?

He who is waiting  
In the rain outside,  
He who is standing  
Where the dew drops wide,  
He who is watching  
In the wind must ride  
(Tho' the pale hands cling)  
With the rose  
And the ring  
And the bride,  
Must ride  
With the red of the rose,  
And the gold of the ring,  
And the lips and the hair of the bride.

Surely for a young poet who made his *début* with verses like the above, full of freshness, strength, and rush, there was very little left to learn in the way of craftsmanship. Who had been his masters? The spelling 'tho' and some preoccupation with 'nature red in tooth and claw' point to Tennyson. Some stanzaic forms testify to a study of Browning<sup>1)</sup>; so does

<sup>1)</sup> Browning's 'Love among the Ruins' must have furnished the stanza of 'Fifty Pounds a Year and a Pension':

I can never see the sun walk in the dawn  
On a lawn  
Where the lark sang mad with rapture as he came  
Robed in flame  
Racing on to where the mountains' foreheads loom  
Through the gloom....

For I've sat my life away with pen and rule  
On a stool,  
Totting little lines of figures, and so will,  
Tho' the chill  
And the languor of grey hairs upon my brow  
Mocks me now.

the character of 'dramatic lyrics' that several of these *insurgent* utterances reveal, e.g. the monologue of that well-known 'mythical' Irish figure, *the Red-haired Man's Wife*:

I have taken that vow  
And you were my friend  
But yesterday — now  
All that's at an end,  
And you are my husband, and claim me, and I must depend....

My old name is lost,  
My distinction of race:  
Now the line has been crossed,  
Must I step to your pace?  
Must I walk as you list, and obey, and smile up in your face?....

Must I bow when you speak,  
Be silent and hear,  
Inclining my cheek  
And incredulous ear  
To your voice, and command and behest, hold your lightest wish dear?

In spite of appearances these stanzas owe less, I think, to Swinburne's *Hertha*<sup>1</sup>), than to Bret Harte's *Heathen Chinee*, but their real affinities are with James Lee's *Wife*. They are not declamatory, they do not invite *chanting*, they are speech, and their lines have, with the same number of *beats*, a smaller number of syllables than Swinburne's have. The little volume contains twenty-six poems. I have failed to detect in them not only anything reminiscent of Keats, Shelley, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron, Rossetti, and Milton (with the problematical exception of the line *Robed in flame*, quoted in my first note), but also anything that savours of the drawing-room 'Kelt'. It does not even contain a trace of Irish nationalism, and this in spite of its title, which would lead the intending reader to expect many 'a winged song against the hulk of England's wrong' as Joseph Campbell has it. James Stephens's *Insurrections* are not concerned with the age-long feud between Gael and Sassenach; they are of woman turning against man, of humanitarian arraigning society, of old age cursing its helplessness, of man quarrelling with existence and the established order of things. It is characteristic that in the last-mentioned kind of insurrection there is one rebel who comes out victorious, and he is a madman, *Tomas an Buile*, 'Crazy Tom', boasting in a pub of his victory:

I saw God. Do you doubt it?  
Do you dare to doubt it?  
I saw the Almighty Man. His hand  
Was resting on a mountain, and  
He looked upon the World and all about it:  
I saw him plainer than you see me now,  
You mustn't doubt it.

He was not satisfied;  
His look was all dissatisfied.  
His beard swung on a wind far out of sight  
Behind the world's<sup>2</sup>) curve, and there was light  
Most fearful from His forehead, and He sighed,  
"That star went always wrong, and from the start  
I was dissatisfied."

<sup>1</sup>) Or to the death of Meleager in 'Atalanta'. — It seems probable that Swinburne composed (or invented) the pattern under the combined influence of Poe's *For Annie* and Shelley's *Ode to a Skylark*.

<sup>2</sup>) Most likely to be pronounced in two syllables (*wurruld's*), Irish fashion.

He lifted up His hand —

I say He heaved a dreadful hand  
Over the spinning Earth, then I said, "Stay,  
You must not strike it, God; I'm in the way;  
And I will never move from where I stand."  
He said, "Dear child, I feared that you were dead,"  
And stayed His hand.

I have quoted the above stanzas for a special reason, because they exemplify James Stephens's effective use of *iteration*, a thing to which he is much addicted and which is to be found neither in Browning nor in Tennyson and for which I can find a parallel only in the *pantoum*<sup>1</sup>). Like the two renowned Victorians and unlike the majority of his contemporaries, he is fond of experimenting in metre and of testing the effect of new stanzaic forms. Now and then he subdues an old form to his use, even such forms as would appear to have yielded up their last secrets, — and draws new melodies out of the well-worn Spenserian stanza, as in his 'Ballad' (meaning *ballade*) 'To a Tree':

Ballad! I have a message you must bear  
Unto a certain tree . . . . .

Say — I will come before the day is done,  
When the cool evening trembles to the dark  
And one ray only of the dying sun  
Rests on her topmost branches, when the lark  
Dips steeply to the grasses in the park  
And only now and then sends from below  
Her sleepy song: then, swift as to the mark  
An arrow flies, so swiftly I will go  
Nor stay until her branches wide I halt below.

There is a crow, a fowl of evil fame,  
Whom one day by the grace of God I'll slay,  
Because he has adventured to my dame  
And in her bosom hides himself away:  
A wicked, curious crow, all hoary-grey;  
He listens to her heart that throbs so fleet  
Along the trunk and by the slender way  
Of her young veins whereat the branches meet:  
A curious, bad, old, wicked crow and indiscreet . . . .

Is Stephens in love with the tree itself or with its hamadryad? It matters little; he is a lover here, and expresses himself, as genuine lovers will, with an entire absence of sophistication. And yet, of this commodity, too, he has a plentiful store, as will appear in a subsequent section.

### III

Unlike many other first volumes of good verse — e.g. Matthew Arnold's — 'Insurrections' was not only welcomed by discriminating critics, but found appreciative readers as well. In *The Hill of Vision*, a bigger and greater book of verse, which followed in 1912 (Stephens had by that time also published a prose tale called 'The Charwoman's Daughter'), the insurgent note, though still present, is not nearly so loud and insistent, and we may safely assume that there was some causal link between the measure of success that had already come to the poet and the considerable quantity of sweetness and light and geniality that we find in the pages of the new

<sup>1</sup>) The introduction of this Malayan stanza into German and European literature is indisputably the work of Adelbert von Chamisso ('Morgenblatt' paper Nr. 4, 1822).

book. He even attempts cosmic reconcilements in the ancient Persian vein, seeing, in the fullness of time, past the furthest star of space, Satan sitting alone :

Old and haggard was his face;  
For his work was done and he  
Rested in eternity.

And to him from out the sun  
Came his father and his friend  
Saying, now the work is done  
Enmity is at an end;  
And he guided Satan to  
Paradieses that he knew.

Gabriel without a frown,  
Uriel without a spear,  
Raphael came singing down  
Welcoming their ancient peer,  
And they seated him beside  
One who had been crucified.

Or he gives — an easier task — pleasanter aspects of things that distressed him before. 'Insurrections' contains an unforgettable bit of realistic verse, in which an old and lonely man, inveighing against fate, comforts his cold and bitter heart by thinking what he would do and say to a wizened, doddering lout (like himself), if he became young again. But 'Danny Murphy' in the 'Hill of Vision' is far different from 'Ould Snarly Gob'; though unable, like the latter, to walk aright or to keep his pipe lit, and though lean and twisted up and withered, he can be young again and laugh.

And again, the poet acknowledges mistakes. Doing wrong is bad, exaggerated feeling of self is bad too; both combined bring double punishment. He is ashamed, not daring to lift his eyes, thinking everybody has heard what he has done, seeing everywhere scornful glances, hearing on all sides malignant buzzing and sniggering.

'And then I looked, but there was no one nigh,  
No eyes that stabbed like swords or glinted sly,  
No laughter creaking on the silent air:  
And then I found that I was all alone  
Facing my soul, and next I was aware  
That this mad mockery was all my own.'

In my opinion it is especially a record of a personal and at the same time general experience as the above, an artistic record with carefully chosen words carefully arranged, that endears a poet to his reader. We may reject the cry of *Art for art's sake*, we may look upon poetry as the intensest form of speech, and, saying so, implicitly insist (with Guyau) on the social function of poetry as of every art, — too often nowadays do we come across so-called critiques which are not critiques at all, being solely concerned with content and not with form. Poet A. may 'see' that life is nothing, and Poet B. may 'see' quite the reverse, Poet X. may state with absolute conviction that the world is nothing but illusion, whereas Poet Y. insists that it is a bundle of hay, mankind being the asses tugging at it, — and to harp exclusively on the ideas we find in a writer is absurd. Because a man is gifted with strange power of speech it does not follow that his vision can penetrate deeper than another's into the mysteries of existence. Let him look in his heart and write what he feels, causing responsive echoes to ring in the hearts of readers and hearers. The ineffectual and impersonal will in course of time be rejected together with the vicious and unhelpful, and humanity will cherish the remainder all the more.

It is another thing to familiarize oneself with an author's views of life as a preliminary stage to criticism proper, which is concerned with the relation of content to form. Evolutionism e.g. being nowadays in the air everywhere it is only natural that James Stephens should respond to the doctrine, and should respond differently as his moods vary. One day he will wish for 'a hand as big as God's to smash creation into smithereens', proceeding dejectedly:

'The weary ages that have drifted by,  
The ages that have still to shirk and slink,  
Have fashioned us the image of an eye,  
And brains that weary when they try to think.'

For all is as it was, and all will be  
Experimental still in ages hence:  
Poor eyes that ache because they cannot see!  
Poor minds that strive without a recompense!'

But another, doubtless brighter, day will inspire the flippancy of 'The Monkey's Cousin':

I shall reach up, I shall grow  
Till the high gods say — "Hello,  
Little brother, you must stop  
Ere our shoulders you o'ertop."

I shall grow up, I shall reach  
Till the little gods beseech  
— "Master, wait a little, do,  
We are running after you!"

I shall bulk and swell and scale  
Till the little gods shall quail,  
Running here and there to hide  
From the terror of my stride.

And now the reader is kindly requested, not to ponder for a moment on the vistas opened here, or on the possible truth or error of perfectibilism, but to account for the way the iambic pentameters of the former poem help to express weariness, whilst the trimeters of the latter could not possibly be replaced by longer lines without ceasing to be infectiously buoyant. This is technical criticism, and it must not be taken for granted. When paintings and drawings are criticized we often get an overdose of it. In the case of poems the opposite takes place, which is altogether wrong, seeing that literature is an art and should be judged as an art. The admission may be made that a very few poets present us with a fairly consistent philosophy of life. We need not go for such a thing to the majority of poets, and James Stephens is of them. He is, as an artist, satisfied with his apprehensions of ultimate truth. Can any person go further? As absolute comprehension is impossible, every *system* must be incomplete, must leave out much that is essential.

#### IV

After 'The Hill of Vision' Stephens's fountain of verse gradually runs dry. True, 'The Adventures of Seumas Beg' (Seumas Beg = Little James [Stephens]), published in 1915, contains many memorable things. So does 'Songs from the Clay', which was brought out in the same year. In both we find new experiments in metre; both testify to his perennial freshness of vision. 'Seumas Beg' will bear comparison with de la Mare's poems of childhood, and it must be remembered that at the time of their composition the latter poet was by no means so much to the fore as he is now. It seems

to me that Walter de la Mare's methods are more conscious than Stephens's, and that he often gives us recapturings, willed recollections, whilst 'Seumas Mor' just uses the raw material that surges up spontaneously from the deeps of his memory. I do not think that any attentive reader, disregarding for a moment the self-assertion characteristic of Stephens but virtually absent from de la Mare, would mistake 'The Devil's Bag' for the work of the latter:

I saw the Devil walking down the lane  
 Behind our house. — There was a heavy bag  
 Strapped tightly on his shoulders, and the rain  
 Sizzled when it hit him. He picked a rag  
 Up from the ground and put it in his sack,  
 And grinned and rubbed his hands. There was a thing  
 Moving inside the bag upon his back —  
 It must have been a soul! I saw it fling  
 And twist about inside, and not a hole  
 Or cranny for escape! Oh, it was sad!  
 I cried, and shouted out, "*Let out that soul!*"  
 But he turned round, and, sure, his face went mad,  
 And twisted up and down, and he said "*Hell!*"  
 And ran away . . . Oh, mammy! I'm not well.

In 'Songs from the Clay' we get, in the shape of an impressive poem on *Deirdre*, the Irish Helena, the first intimation that the poet begins to look about for subject-matter. That his inventive power is not great was proved by 'The Charwoman's Daughter', a prose-tale full of limpidity and charm, but unsubstantial. It was confirmed by subsequent prose volumes like 'The Crock of Gold'. And as concentration is the essence of poetical writing, and as James Stephens is too good an artist to deal in Lamartine-like dilutions, and as the production of literary *pemmican* in the form of poems is less remunerative than the steaks and chops of prose, I think we can understand why the poet, married and a father, became estranged from his Muse. 'Green Branches' and 'A Poetry Recital' hardly count; besides, the latter volume contains little that is new in addition to some salvage, chiefly from 'Insurrections'. A volume full of good things is *Reincarnations* (1918), containing free metrical translations of Gaelic poems by Raftery, O'Bruadair and others, those after O'Bruadair, Niagaras of splendid vituperation, affording, perhaps, the greatest delight, though the last stanzas seem sadly prophetic of Stephens's own career as a poet:

I will sing no more songs: the pride of my country I sang  
 Through forty long years of good rhyme, without any avail;  
 And no one cared even as much as the half of a hang  
 For the song or the singer, so here is an end to the tale.

If a person should think I complain and have not got the cause,  
 Let him bring his eyes here and take a good look at my hand,  
 Let him say if a goose-quill has calloused this poor pair of paws  
 Or the spade that I grip on and dig with out there in the land?

When the great ones were safe and renowned and were rooted and tough,  
 Though my mind went to them and took joy in the fortune of those,  
 And pride in their pride and their fame, they gave little enough,  
 Not as much as two boots for my feet, or an old suit of clothes.

I ask of the Craftsman that fashioned the fly and the bird,  
 Of the Champion whose passion will lift me from death in a time,  
 Of the Spirit that melts icy hearts with the wind of a word,  
 That my people be worthy, and get better singing than mine.

I had hoped to live decent, when Ireland was quit of her care,  
 As a bailiff or steward perhaps in a house of degree,  
 But my end of the tale is, old brogues and old britches to wear,  
 So I'll sing no more songs for the men that care nothing for me.

Though the glorious prose-romance called 'The Crock of Gold' preceded the miscellaneous collection of sketches and tales entitled 'Here are Ladies' by a year, we may safely assume that the latter volume contains a good deal of older work, much of it being realistic and grim, like 'Insurrections'. Stephens is a romantic who was quite glad to turn his back (in his literary work at any rate) upon 'woeful misery' and to let his imagination remould the sorry scheme of things to his satisfaction. Occasionally he will point out that the artist must be paid, as in 'The Demi-Gods' (pp. 203, 204) where we are told how a ballad-singer composed a curse against dirty louts who do not pay the musician, a passage with which we may compare a poem called 'The Market' in 'Songs from the Clay' (p. 37). Occasionally he betrays some uneasiness whether the romantic attitude to life and art is justified or not, as in 'Irish Fairy Tales' (one of his more recent volumes) in which he presents us (p. 272) with the remarkable verdict: 'Under all wrong-doing lies personal vanity or the feeling that we are endowed and privileged beyond our fellows.... The mind flinches even from the control of natural law, and how much more from the despotism of its own separated likenesses, for if another can control me that other has usurped me, and how terribly I seem diminished by the seeming addition! — This sense of separateness is vanity, and is the bed of wrong-doing. For we are not freedom, we are control, and we must submit to our own function ere we can exercise it.' Here we find ourselves in the neighbourhood of Tennyson and Ruskin, but several other quotations might be given in which the spirit of Jean Jacques is heard. In 'The Crock of Gold' (p. 102) Pan sneers at noble intellects that 'conceive virtue as repression and self-sacrifice as an honourable thing instead of the suicide which it is'. It is true the Philosopher who hears this statement is immediately made to reply that it is very interesting to hear this, 'and if it is true the whole conduct of life will have to be very much simplified', but as the book closes with the deliverance of the Philosopher from *prison* by a rout of irresponsible Irish fairies, we are after all left to side with Pan, and the obvious moral is that which we also find expressed in one of the *Songs from the Clay* (p. 97):

Because our lives are cowardly and sly,  
Because we do not dare to take or give,  
Because we scowl and pass each other by,  
We do not live; we do not dare to live.

We dive, each man, into his secret house,  
And bolt the door, and listen in affright,  
Each timid man beside a timid spouse,  
With timid children huddled out of sight.

• • • • •  
Let us go out and walk upon the road,  
And quit for evermore the brickbuilt den,  
The lock and key, the hidden, shy abode  
That separates us from our fellowmen.

And by contagion of the sun we may  
Catch at a spark from that primeval fire,  
And learn that we are better than our clay,  
And equal to the peaks of our desire.

This is *ethical romanticism*, but more often we find James Stephens displaying a different kind of romanticism, viz. that of the intellect. Then he provides us with pages upon pages of most delectable fooling in the form of Swiftian

or Rabelaisian sophistication. I quote some passages from *There is a Tavern in the Town* ('Here are Ladies', pp. 308-310) in which an old gentleman, presumably father to the Philosopher in 'The Crock of Gold', holds forth as follows :

"Language may be described as a medium for recording one's sensations. It is gesture translated into sound. It is noise with a meaning. Music cannot at all compare with it, for music is no more than the scientific distribution of noise, and it does not impart any meaning to the disintegrated and harried tumults. Language may be divided into several heads, which, again, may be subdivided almost indefinitely — The primary heads are, language, talk, and speech. Speech is the particular form of noise which is made by Members of Parliament. Language is the symbols whereby one lady in a back street makes audible her impressions of the lady who lives on the same floor — it is often extremely sinewy. Talk may be described as the crime of people who make one tired.

"It is my opinion that people talk too much. I think the world would be a healthier and better place if it were more silent. On every day that passes there is registered over all the earth a vast amount of language which, so far as I can see, has not the slightest bearing on anything anywhere.

"I have been told of a race living in Central Africa, or elsewhere, who by an inherent culture were enabled to dispense with speech. They whistled, and by practice had attained so copious and flexible a vocabulary that they could whistle good-morning and good-night, or how-do-you-do with equal facility and distinction. This, while it is a step in the right direction, is not a sufficiently long step. To live among these people might appear very like living in a cageful of canaries or parrots. Parrots are a very superior race who usually travel with sailors. They have a whistle which can be guided or deflected into various byways. I once knew a parrot who was employed by a sailorman to curse for him when his own speech was suspended by liquor. He could also whistle ballads and polkas, and had attained an astonishing proficiency in these arts; for, by long practice he could dovetail curses and whistles in a most energetic and, indeed, astonishing manner. It would often project two whistles and a curse, sometimes two curses and a whistle, while all the time keeping faithfully to the tune of 'The Sailor's Grave' or another. It was a highly cultivated and erudite person. As it advanced in learning it took naturally to chewing tobacco, but, being a person of strongly experimental habits, it tried one day to curse and whistle and chew tobacco at the one moment, with the unfortunate result that a piece of honeydew got jammed between a whistle and a curse, and the poor thing perished miserably of strangulation.

"It is indeed singular that while every race of mankind is competent to speak, none of the other races, such as cats, cows, caterpillars, and crabs, have shown the slightest interest in the making of this ordered noise. This is the more strange when we reflect that almost all animals are provided with a throat and a mouth which are capable of making a noise certainly equal in volume and intelligibility to the sounds made by a German or a Spaniard.

"Long ago men lived in trees and had elongated backbones which they were able to twitch. There were no shops, theatres, or churches in those times, and, consequently, no necessity for a specialised and meticulous prosody. Man barked at his fellow-man when he wanted something, and if his request was not understood he bit his fellow-man and was quit of him. When they forsook the trees and became ground-walkers they came into contact with a variety of theretofore unknown objects, the necessity for

naming which so exercised their tongues that gradually their bark took on a different quality and became susceptible of more complicated sounds. Then, with the dawning of the Pastoral Age, food in a gregarious community became a matter of more especial importance. When a man barked at his wife for a cocoa-nut and she handed him a baby or a bowl of soup or an evening paper, it became necessary, in order to minimise her alternatives, that he should elaborate his bark to meet this and an hundred other circumstances. I do not know at what period of history man was able to call his wife names with the certainty of reprisal. It was possible quite early, because I have often heard a dog bark in a dissatisfied and important manner at another dog and be perfectly comprehended.

"A difficulty would certainly arise as to the selection of a word when forty or fifty men might at the same time label any article with as many different names, and it is reasonable to suppose, that they would be reluctant to adopt any other expression but that of their own creation. In such a crux the strongest man of the community would be likely to clout the others to an admission that his terminology was standard.

"Thus, by slow accretions, the various languages crept into currency, and the youth of innumerable schoolboys has been embittered by having to learn to spell."

## VI

One could go on quoting for ever. Passages like the above might be matched or capped with others, from 'The Crock of Gold', from 'The Demi-Gods' (the germ or nucleus of which is to be found in one of the tales of 'Here are Ladies'), from 'The Land of Youth'. I will not do so, however. I might also draw attention to another romantic trait (one may say weakness) of Stephens: his addiction to the *Deus ex Machina*. As, however, it would be needless to do so, any reader being able to see it, I will give in succession some passages illustrating his æsthetic views and some others which seem to me remarkable for their wisdom.

"A cow can snort and be dignified at the one moment and .... timidity is comely in a sheep." ('Irish Fairy Tales', p. 38).

"There was a marsh ....; a complicated, mysterious, dank, slippery, reedy, treacherous life, but with its own beauty and an allurement that could grow on one, so that you could forget the solid world and love only that which quaked and gurgled." (Id. 56, 57).

"A poem is a revelation, and it is by the brink of running water that poetry is revealed to the mind." (Id. 68).

"His mind dwelt on the rules of metre, the cunningness of words, and the need for a clean, brave mind." (Id. 70).

"His wife's voice was sweeter to Fionn than the singing of a lark. She filled him with wonder and surmise. There was magic in the tips of her fingers. Her thin palm ravished him. Her slender foot set his heart beating; and whatever way her head moved there came a new shape of beauty to her face. — "She is always new," said Fionn." (Id. 131.).

"Fionn Mac Uail .... was not only a soldier, he was a poet also, that is, a man of science, and whatever was strange or unusual had an irresistible attraction for him." (Id. 225).

"Conn recognised, as all men do, that one who is lovely must also be good." (Id. 252).

"Loveliness can be found in every village, but beauty is rarer than aught else, and the whole world is a-tilt for it.... Loveliness is a gentleness

of the body and of the emotions, but beauty is a nobility of the mind." ("In the Land of Youth", p. 173).

Leaving the reader to digest these pronouncements of an artist on what touches an artist nearest, and to compare Stephens's views on beauty with, say, those of D. H. Lawrence (e.g. in 'The Lost Girl'), I proceed to quote him as a *sage*:

"The past.... is seldom as far behind us as we could wish: it is more often in front, blocking the way, and the future trips over it just when we think that the road is clear and joy our own." ("Irish Fairy Tales", p. 106).

"Men will walk soberly in the evening, however they go in the day." (Id. 122).

"We may think with our minds and with our tongues, but we should never think with our noses and with our eyebrows." (Id. 153).

"Women and birds are able to see without turning their heads, and that is indeed a necessary provision, for they are both surrounded by enemies." ("The Demi-Gods", p. 14).

"The remarkable thing about astonishment is that it can only last for an instant. No person can be surprised for more than that time. You will come to terms with a ghost within two minutes of its appearance." (Id. 15).

"Man is a scientific creature; he labels his ignorance and shelves it: mystery affrights him, it bores him, but when he has given a name to any appearance then mystery flies away, and reality alone remains for his cogitation. Later, perhaps, reality will enrage and mystify him more profoundly than any unexpectedness can do." (Id. 16).

"Is there actually a wolf in our neighbour? We see that which we are, and our eyes project on every side an image of ourselves; if we look with love, then the colours of heaven are repeated to us from the ditch and the dungeon.... we scatter our sins broadcast and call them our neighbours'; let us scatter our virtues abroad and build us a city to live in." (Id. 54).

## VII

It would be difficult to find a modern author from whose work more 'good things' could be picked than from James Stephens's. 'The Crock of Gold' is full of them, 'The Demi-Gods', if possible, even fuller. The plots of both are slight enough. I have stated before that Stephens does not show much power of invention and I may add that he showed both wisdom and acumen in turning to Irish legend and tradition for his subject-matter. His great gift, I repeat it because it is essential, is his vision of things real and things imaginary. He is bound upon eternal quests, he is continually having the most thrilling adventures. The plot of *The Demi-Gods* shows some resemblance to that of *The Wonderful Visit* by Wells. Stephens gives us the experiences of three castaway angels on earth, Wells those of one, whose fate, though he is kindly received by a good and hospitable clergyman, soon becomes tragic. Stephens's three fall in with tramps, feast their eyes on what they see, learn to smoke, play pranks, and go away after exhausting the possibilities of their adventure. Again and again it is their author and creator who appears to be such an open-eyed, ever-delighted visitant himself. Is there anything in literature to beat the following passage for freshness?

"There are so many things in a river to look at. The movement of the water in itself exercises fascinations over a boy. There are always bubbles, based strongly in froth, sailing gallantly along. — One speculates how long a bubble will swim before it hits a rock, or is washed into nothing by an

eddy, or is becalmed in a sheltered corner to ride at jaunty anchor with a navy of similarly delicate tonnage.

Further, if one finds a twig on the path, or a leaf, there is nothing more natural than to throw these into the river and see how fast or how erratically they sail. Pebbles also clamour to be cast into the stream. Perhaps a dragon-fly whirls above the surface of the water to hold one late from school. The grasses and rushes by the marge may stir as a grey rat slips out to take to the water and swim low down and very fast on some strange and important journey. The inspection of such an event cannot be hurried. One must, if it is possible, discover where he swims to, and if his hole is found it has to be blocked up with stones, even though the persistent bell is clanging down over the fields.

Perhaps a big frog will push out from the grass and go in fat leaps down to the water — plop! and away he swims with his sarcastic nose up and his legs going like fury. The strange, very-little-boy motions of a frog in water is a thing to ponder over. There are small frogs also, every bit as interesting, thin-legged, round-bellied anatomies who try to jump two ways at once when they are observed, and are caught so easily that it is scarcely worth one's trouble to chase them at all."

This quotation ('Here are Ladies', p. 270) seems a fit note on which to end, and here we will leave our author, who still is able to see 'through whatever mists and doubttings the vision of a gaiety wherein the innocence of the morning will not any longer be strange to our maturity'. ('Crock of Gold', p. 147).

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

### Appendix: Bibliography.

	<i>Out of print.</i>
Insurrections (Maunsel, 1909).	
The Charwoman's Daughter (1911).	4/6
The Hill of Vision (1912).	6/-
The Crock of Gold (1912).	6/-
Here are Ladies (1913).	6/-
The Demi-Gods (1914).	6/-
The Adventures of Seumas Beg (1915).	4/6
Songs from the Clay (1915).	4/6
Reincarnations (1918).	3/6
Irish Fairy Tales (1920).	7/6
Deirdre (1923).	7/6
In the Land of Youth (1924).	7/6
A Poetry Recital (1925).	3/6

All of these with Macmillans.

### Notes and News.

**English Studies in Italy.** There is hardly a second country in Europe to which England is more indebted since she awoke to literary life, than Italy: from the day when Chaucer learnt a new dramatic treatment of the tale by observing Italian everyday life — rather than by imitating Boccaccio — up to the day when Robert Browning found among Italians the real men

and women worth the poet's song, what a glorious part Italy has played in English imagination! The country which supplied Shakespeare and the Elizabethan dramatists with their most poignant plots, Milton with a language in which he delighted to compose sonnets, Shelley with landscapes which aroused his lyric genius, Swinburne with political events which inspired some of his noblest songs, was in the best position intellectually, one would think, to take the lead in English Studies abroad. Still, curiously enough, nothing less than the European war was needed to awake in Italy the conviction that English Studies were an indispensable branch of learning: it was thus, only in consequence of an accidental occurrence of this nature, that a study, which all possible cultural reasons combined to recommend, came to be accepted as a medium of deeper, wider understanding between two allied nations, subservient, so to say, to political ends.

In fact, English Studies in Italy, as a special department in Universities, really date from the establishment of a policy of intellectual propaganda among the Allied Powers, culminating in 1918 with the Decree of the then Minister of Education Berenini concerning University chairs of English, and the foundation of the British Institute in Florence, at first mainly supported by the English Government.

Anyhow, Signor Berenini's *Fiat* would have very likely remained a dead letter, had it not been able to link on to an already existing, though not official, organisation of some sort. In the comparative inefficiency of this pre-existing organisation is to be found the chief reason why the Berenini Decree has not yet given the results one might have anticipated. Another reason, by no means of secondary importance, is the lack of funds for furthering the scheme.

It is all very well to say: We shall have English chairs in the Universities. Unless you get the right sort of people to fill the chairs, and a sufficient amount of money to endow them, you may as well expect a tree to blossom in midwinter. Now, the state of affairs had been such in Italy, in the years immediately preceding the Berenini Decree, that when the one chair of English Literature then existing, the Rome chair, became vacant in consequence of Prof. F. Garlanda's death, nobody applied for the advertised post. The Free University (Accademia scientifico-letteraria) of Milan had to appoint an English lady, Miss L. E. Marshall, as *incaricata* (or Lecturer in charge), as no native Italian was available. By the time of the Berenini Decree conditions had improved in that respect, but, generally speaking, no school of English had hitherto existed in Italy, and the few English scholars owed their training entirely to private efforts or to particular circumstances which had enabled them to come into touch with English Universities.

All this does not necessarily imply that students of English Literature had not previously existed in Italy, nor that works on English Literature had been unknown as a feature of our intellectual life. But it is quite possible to write books on English Literature, and still to lack the amount of professional training necessary for University teaching, either on account of the limitation of the studies to a particular period or subject, or of the lack of knowledge of the living language.

Eminent literary men had dealt with English Literature in the last fifty years: men like Enrico Nencioni, Adolfo de Bosis, and, quite recently, Emilio Cecchi. But none of their writings could be termed a scholarly work; so much the better, one might think, for their purely literary value. Nencioni's critical essays on Nineteenth Century English authors, de Bosis' studies and translations of Shelley, Cecchi's History of English Literature in the XIX<sup>th</sup> Century not only contributed largely to make the Italian public acquainted

with the writers dealt with, but were in themselves literary works often achieving a high standard of aesthetic criticism, even if seldom attaining the exactness of detail required for a work of scholarship. De Bosis was mainly a translator, but, being himself a good poet, his translations stand out from the huge mass of works of similar kind produced in Italy at every epoch. From the moment when English Literature first became the vogue in the Italy of the Eighteenth Century<sup>1)</sup>, translators of every description, too frequently mere dilettanti, had sought their food on the pleasant slopes of the British Parnassus; with what advantage for the advancement of learning in general and of poetry in particular, no one could really tell. But if the multitudinous translations of the *Rape of the Lock*, of Byron's *Tales*, of Elizabeth Browning's poems, etc., contributed practically nothing to English Studies, still such performances somehow helped to create the favourable atmosphere in which people felt how much was missed by knowing so little about one of the greatest literatures of the world. The instance of the three writers referred to above is illustrative of the kind of attention given by Italian men of letters to English Literature: only the modern period of it has been studied by them, whereas on the preceding ages they have but little to say. In their writings English Literature appears more or less like a flower without a stalk. Of course there is Shakespeare, and since every country in Europe has produced an almost cumbrous amount of translations of and essays on that greatest of poets, one could not expect Italy to lag behind. We have, in fact, Shakespeare's plays done into Italian, either separately or as a whole, either in prose or in verse; but notwithstanding the more or less meritorious efforts of people like Carcano, Rusconi, Angeli, Muccioli, we are in the same unfortunate position as every other European country, with the exception of Germany, in being without a possible translation of Shakespeare. Still, good monographs on Shakespeare are not rare in other countries, and it is really a cause of wonder to see how late Italy has been in producing an important work on the subject, namely Croce's essay, which is perhaps the only Italian book on English Literature commanding universal attention.

The state of English Studies in Italy in the period immediately preceding the war may be easily imagined when we consider how, apart from C. Chiarini at the Florentine *Magistero* (Women's Training College) and E. C. Longobardi at the Commercial School of Venice, the few Italians who could be styled English Scholars by no means confined their activities to the study of English: neither for C. Formichi, nor for A. Farinelli, nor G. S. Gargano has English ever been the sole interest.

The *incaricati* appointed in the Universities of Turin, Pavia, Pisa, Florence, Rome, Naples, Messina and Palermo in consequence of the Berenini Decree<sup>2)</sup>, found that everything had still to be done in the way of basing the teaching of English on philological grounds. Even though competent University teachers, as R. Piccoli, A. Ricci, F. Olivero, G. Ferrando, had made their appearance in the meanwhile, students coming to the Universities from secondary schools had hardly English enough to start serious work at once, and, worst of all, in public as well as in University libraries English Literature had been badly neglected for a long time. The indispensable texts were not there, the amount of money supplied for the more urgent needs was almost negligible: it is only recently that the Library of the University of Pisa out of a grant

<sup>1)</sup> See A. Graf, *L'Anglomania e l'influsso inglese in Italia nel Secolo XVIII*, Torino, 1911.

<sup>2)</sup> Naples has now a full professorship; Turin also will shortly have one.

for new acquisitions was unable to allocate more than two thousand Italian lire (less than twenty pounds) to the purchase of the invariably expensive English books. In such conditions the teaching of English in Universities could not become at once strictly scientific; the first step had to be the preparation of a general course on the main outlines and characteristics of English Literature, such as was advocated by C. Formichi and G. Ferrando in very sensible articles written soon after the Berenini Decree. This is still, more or less, the stage to which the teaching of English has attained in Italian Universities.

A momentous event, as regards the raising of the standard of students, has been the foundation of the British Institute of Florence. This important institution, inaugurated in June 1918, was part of the plan of the English Government for promoting English Studies in Italy as a means of intensifying intellectual relations with the allied country, a plan which found some sort of complement in the almost contemporary publication of Anglo-Italian reviews in London (*Anglo-Italian Review*), Florence (*La Vita Britannica*) and Milan (*Rassegna Italo-Britannica*). But whereas the reviews proved a short-lived device of political propaganda, destined to disappear as soon as the event which had called them into being, namely the war, ceased to exist (only the *Anglo-Italian Review* surviving until May 1921, owing to its transformation from a mainly literary periodical into an organ of economic information), the British Institute has grown in importance ever since and may well be said to have fulfilled the chief promises contained in its manifesto: namely, the foundation of a large English library, the teaching of English, the promotion of lectures etc. calculated to extend the knowledge of English intellectual life among the Italians. The Library of the Institute amounts now to about 10,000 volumes — among which the important collection of the late Herbert Trench presented by the poet's widow —, and is constantly increasing. As a result, Florence is now the best place in Italy in which to study English Literature, in the same way as Rome possesses the best Italian library of American books, through the initiative of Henry Nelson Gay.

By agreement with the University of Florence, attendance at the classes of Middle English and Anglo-Saxon held at the British Institute by Prof. A. Ricci (who, with F. Olivero and F. Viglione has started in Italy the study of early English texts) is required for students wanting to take English as a subject for a degree. There is some hope of advertising shortly a chair of Old English at the University of Florence itself. In consequence of the said agreement, the first Italian students' theses in Old English have been presented in Florence. The British Institute yearly instructs about two hundred students and with the aid of the British-Italian League of London tries to facilitate a sojourn in England for those of them who intend to complete their studies.

After the end of the war the British Government ceased to support the Institute, which had to carry on as best it could with the help of private donations. These, however, have proved quite sufficient to secure a steady support, chiefly through the munificence of Sir Walter Becker, Mr. Arthur Serena, Miss Caurtauld, Sir Daniel Stevenson, and also through funds collected among the large British colony of Florence, for whom the Institute supplies a reading club.

One cannot emphasize enough the importance of having in Italy an English library like that of the Florentine Institute. As I have already pointed out, one of the chief obstacles to English Studies in Italy lies in the difficulty in which students find themselves of getting hold of the volumes required

for the study of their subject. Even if some of them could afford to purchase the books needed, there are works out of print which no Italian library has ever tried to secure. Unfortunately, neither students nor professors can really afford to buy expensive books, and if English books seem expensive even to English people, one can easily imagine what they represent to Italian pockets. Take for instance a standard work like E. K. Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage*. The acquisition of it means to the average Italian University professor a considerable sacrifice; for an Italian University library it entails a serious drain on the grants allotted to the English Department. Moreover, Italian booksellers, as a rule, do not keep English books in stock, apart from a few classics in the most popular editions. Whereas new French novels, poems, scientific works of every kind, even limited editions, are on sale at every important bookseller's, and German publications can be easily obtained, English books have to be ordered specially, and reach the purchaser after a delay of several weeks. English publishers do not send any of their publications for sale or return, have no agent in Italy from whom booksellers in the provinces could easily be supplied, practically never send presentation copies to the leading papers and reviews, even if asked to do so by the would-be reviewers, in a word, utterly disregard the Italian market. The strictly commercial point of view of neglecting a country which could hardly be a good customer because of the disadvantage of the exchange, undoubtedly prevails; and the principle would be a sound one, if books had to be considered as an ordinary commodity. Still, though English books had few chances of attaining a speedy diffusion in years when the knowledge of English was very rare in Italy, this cannot be said any longer to-day. Among students and men of letters there are many who would be ready to purchase some expensive English book they have seen advertised, and are only held back by the fact that there is no other way of seeing what the book is actually like, except to commit themselves by ordering it, whether they like it or not on closer inspection. Many remedies for this hopeless state of affairs were suggested in 1918, chiefly by two well-known literary men, G. Prezzolini and A. Sorani, but although some of the English publishers responded to the propositions made in the Italian press, no agreement could be reached. The mentality of English publishers is still such, that when this year the British Institute declared its willingness to take charge of the English books sent over to Italy for the Florence Book Fair, if English publishers consented to leave them for sale after the conclusion of the Fair, it was confronted with a refusal on the part of the publishing firms.

An attempt at an Italian Tauchnitz Collection was made during the war by the Milan publishers Treves, but it proved unsuccessful and soon had to be discontinued. A much better fate has befallen the English texts printed, with literal translations and notes, in the *Collezione Sansoniana Straniera* ed. by Prof. G. Manacorda: in that extremely useful collection there have already appeared many English classics, among which those edited by R. Piccoli and C. Chiarini deserve to be mentioned.

In recent years the production of books on English Literature has been constantly increasing in Italy. Works like C. Zucchetti's *Shelley e Dante* (with an excellent bibliography), G. de Lorenzo's *Shakespeare e il dolore del mondo*, G. S. Gargano's *Scapigliatura italiana a Londra sotto Elisabetta e Giacomo I*, R. Piccoli's *Drammi elisabettiani*, P. Rèbora's *L'Italia nel dramma inglese*, decidedly mark a step forward. Some of the theses composed at the Universities of Milan and Rome under the direction of L. E. Marshall and C. Formichi respectively, have deserved publication: for instance *Shelley e l'Italia* by M. L. Giartosio di Courten.

A brilliant counterpart to the work done in connection with the Universities is represented by Emilio Cecchi's and Carlo Linati's essays on contemporary English Literature: they compare favourably with the best specimens of the kind written by non-English critics, and, owing to the high reputation enjoyed by their authors, they form a considerable help to the diffusion in Italy of the work of writers such as J. Conrad, D. H. Lawrence, J. Joyce, K. Mansfield, etc.

Unsatisfactory as the present state of English Studies in Italy may seem, if one considers what it used to be only ten years ago, and how much Italians are handicapped in this respect by economic conditions, one cannot but hope for the best, feeling that the most important pledge of progress is to be found in the warm interest, amounting in some cases to actual enthusiasm, for the study of English Literature. Once the period of preliminary preparation is concluded, and the economic difficulties are removed, Italy will not be behind any other country in the field of English Studies.

Liverpool.

M. PRAZ.

**A-examen 1925.** Het Bijvoegsel tot de Staatscourant no. 33 bevat het „Verslag der commissie, in 1925 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelsche taal.” Wij nemen er het volgende uit over:

De vertaling in het Engelsch gaf dit jaar weinig reden tot tevredenheid. De oorzaak hiervan moet gezocht worden in dat gebrek aan idiomatische kennis, waarop hieronder wordt teruggekomen. Het is noodzakelijk, dat de candidaat een behoorlijke kennis heeft van de spraakkunst van zijne moedertaal, alvorens hij de theoretische studie van de vreemde taal begint. Het is immers een onloochenbaar feit, dat de spraakkunst van de moedertaal den besten grondslag vormt voor verdere linguïstische studie. Men zal zich de studie van de Engelsche spraakkunst vergemakkelijken en daarin een beter inzicht verwerven, naarmate de Nederlandsche spraakkunst beter is verwerkt. Eenige studie van de woordorde van het Nederlandsch, het vermogen tot oordeelkundig onderscheid van de rededeelen en een juist begrip van de samenstelling van een zin zullen voor dit doel dienstig zijn. De commissie raadt toekomstigen candidaten dan ook aan in een of ander betrouwbaar werk over de Nederlandsche spraakkunst den bouw van het levende Nederlandsch grondig te bestudeeren.

Vele candidaten gaven blijk de regels voor de uitspraak onvoldoende te kennen. De commissie stelt geen prijs op het uit het hoofd opdreenen van lange lijsten woorden; het bleek haar echter meermalen, dat verwaarloozing van dit onderdeel leidde tot fouten in de praktische uitspraak, zoodat bijv. de klinkers in woorden als *boot*, *food*, *hood* gelijkluidend waren. Derhalve raadt zij den candidaten aan de studie der phonetiek gepaard te doen gaan aan die der uitspraakregels.

Nog wenscht de commissie er op te wijzen, dat de meeste candidaten in het algemeen te weinig aandacht schenken aan de intonatie van het Engelsch. Evenals haar voorganger, wijst de commissie er op, dat een niet al te kort verblijf in Engeland voor de meeste candidaten beslist noodzakelijk is om hun kans van slagen te geven. Te veel candidaten hadden dezen wenk niet ter harte genomen, zoodat de kennis van het idioom veelal beneden redelijke eischen bleef en zoowel de praktische uitspraak als de vaardigheid vaak teleurstelden. Gedurende

en na den wereldoorlog maakten de tijdsomstandigheden een zachte re beoordeeling van deze beide onderdelen noodzakelijk. De commissie meent, dat thans dit standpunt dient te worden opgegeven en dat aan uitspraak en vaardigheid de oude eischen moeten worden gesteld.

Het komt der commissie verder gewenscht voor, dat de candidaten, naast de belletristische lectuur, werken lezen van anderen aard, bij voorbeeld over Staatsinstellingen, onderwijs, rechtspraak, enz. Verschillende deeltjes uit de „Home University Library“ of „The People's Books“ zullen daarbij goede diensten kunnen bewijzen. Niet alleen zal deze lectuur hun idiomatische kennis ten goede komen, doch tevens zal zij hun dat algemeene inzicht schenken in de instellingen en geschiedenis van land en volk, dat voor den toekomstigen docent van een vreemde taal van niet te onderschatten waarde is en dat de belangstelling in zijn te geven onderwijs zeer zal kunnen verhoogen.

---

**American Linguistics.** We have received the first numbers of a new periodical: *Language*, the official journal of the Linguistic Society of America (founded in 1924). We rejoice that American scholars who have already made important contributions to the study of linguistics, not least in the fields of classical and American languages, have considered that the time is ripe for a periodical of their own. It will interest the readers of our review of Dr. Sapir's book to hear that in the second number (see bibliography) the learned author has written the very article we had asked for: a fuller explanation of what he means by Sound-patterns. The article should be read by every one who is interested in language-study. It shows very clearly that phonetics, as I expressed it elsewhere, is not identical with physiology or with physics, or with these two sciences combined, however useful the two are as auxiliary forces to the phonetician. We wish the new periodical god-speed.

---

## Reviews.

*Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*. Edited by KENNETH SISAM. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1921. 7/6 net. 292 pp.

*A Middle English Vocabulary*. By J. R. R. TOLKIEN. Designed for use with Sisam's *Fourteenth Century Prose and Verse*. Clarendon Press. 4/6 net. 1922.

Mr. Sisam's book, together with that of Dr. Joseph Hall (*Selections from Early Middle English*) looks like a modernized edition of the familiar *Specimens of Early English* by Morris and Skeat. And the present selection naturally contains a good many passages or at least works that are familiar to the students of the older readers. Robert Mannyng, Dan Michel of Ayenbite 'fame', Richard Rolle, Piers Plowman, Mandeville, John Barbour, John Wycliffe, Gower, and John of Trevisa are common to both books. But that was unavoidable; and Mr. Sisam has some new selections which may show the altered appreciation of some of the old authors. There is a long specimen of Sir Gawayne and one from the Pearl, which students who imagine they know their Middle English will find hard nuts to crack (a useful exercise

for people with good teeth), and also two dramatic pieces: the York play 'Harrowing of Hell' and the Towneley play of Noah. Chaucer is wisely ignored. There are, further, some well-chosen lyrical specimens. We may say therefore that the student by means of these selections can obtain a very fair idea of what fourteenth century literature in the English tongue is like.

The book is provided with all the help that modern scholarship can put at the disposal of students. As to the texts, a single manuscript is always chosen, and variants are only mentioned in exceptional cases; the book, consequently, does not wish to compete with such a book as the one by Brandl and Zippel, which is adapted to the needs of those who wish to have practical exercises in the critical treatment of a text. Literary students will rarely regret this, and will be more pleased with the admirable introduction, which may not announce new discoveries but is eminently suited to introduce beginners and is equally interesting to advanced students by its freshness of treatment.

The notes at the end are also excellent; and there is, strange to say in the form of an appendix, a short account of the English language, with full bibliographical information. If the form of the Appendix has been chosen to conciliate the prejudices of English reviewers with their amusing dislike to 'philological' information, we admire Mr. Sisam's skill rather than grumble at it. The author was, of course, unable to mention a book that will probably be the standard book of reference for students of Middle English sounds for a long time to come: the *Handbuch der Mittelenglischen Grammatik* by Richard Jordan (Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1925) whose loss English scholarship had recently to deplore.

The task of writing a Glossary to a book will seem a humble one to outsiders. In our opinion, it requires quite as much and quite as valuable scholarship as the editing of the selections. Anyhow, the work has been done by Mr. Tolkien in a way that is worthy of the book that is to be its companion volume. I do not know a single glossary that supplies so much information on Middle English, both of a grammatical and of a lexicological character. Students who take the study of Middle English seriously will be wise in not only using the book in order to find out the meanings of words but also in studying the articles on grammatical form-words, such as pronouns, and in reading the whole of each article instead of looking for the special bit of information required for the passage they happen to have before them. The two books will thus help not only to increase but also to deepen the study of Middle English, each in its own way.

The Hague.

E. KRUISINGA.

---

*Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama.* By H. DUGDALE SYKES.  
 $9\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 231 pp. Oxford University Press. H. Milford, London,  
 1924. 12 s. 6 d.

Mr. Dugdale Sykes, already known to students of English literature by his *Sidelights on Shakespeare* as a scholarly critic, has again presented us with a series of interesting studies dealing with the authorship of sixteenth and seventeenth century plays; a volume of acute and illuminative criticism, which will assuredly be a welcome addition to the library of the Elizabethan scholar. All the essays but one have appeared before in periodicals, most

of them in *Notes and Queries*, one in *The Modern Language Review*. The collection of these studies in one volume is of special value to foreign students, to whom the reviews are not always easily accessible.

The method by which Mr. Sykes arrives at his conclusions is based on internal evidence; he undertakes a comparative analysis of the diction and phraseology of the plays in question and those of the author to whom he ascribes these compositions, producing much evidence to support his theories. The reader is never forced to accept perilous conjectures; Mr. Sykes's arguments are well supported by evidence, which has the merit of being very precise. Mr. Sykes, who is an Elizabethan scholar with an exceedingly extensive reading, is well-qualified for his task by his sensibility and the penetration of his critical eye; we can have nothing but admiration for the resource and fine memory of this learned critic. Though the conclusions drawn from his parallels may not all seem incontestable, they always deserve the most respectful consideration.

The papers deal with eight dramatists, namely: Day, Middleton, Samuel Rowley, Peele, Dekker, Webster, Ford and Field, ascribing plays or shares in plays to these authors, taking the compositions away from other dramatists to whom they had been assigned by publishers or critics.

The first paper tackles "The Problem of *Timon of Athens*". There has been no agreement among critics, whether Shakespeare worked over an older drama of which he retained some parts, or, as others hold, Shakespeare was the original author, the inferior portions having been interpolated by some contemporary dramatist. The latter theory presented by the earlier critic Fleay has been adopted by the recent critics Mr. Deighton in the introduction to the 'Arden' edition, and Dr. Wright in his monograph *The Authorship of 'Timon of Athens.'*<sup>1)</sup> Mr. Sykes rejects this view, and with much convincing evidence adduced in support of his opinion, arrives at the conclusion of the earlier critics Delius and the Cambridge editors that Shakespeare worked over an existing play, or draft of a play. A feature pointing to the conclusion that Shakespeare was the revisor is, according to Mr. Sykes, the shortness of the play; the hypothesis that the play, being too brief for the requirements of the stage, has been expanded by some inferior dramatist, is against the evidence of the text, but the shortness is due to the fact that it has been abbreviated in the revision.

A matter of great interest is that Mr. Sykes finds plain evidence that two authors were concerned in the original play. The difficulties of confusion in the names and some characters, the puzzling contradictions presented by the text, can be explained on the assumption that Shakespeare revised a collaborated play. The most remarkable piece of evidence confirming this conclusion Mr. Sykes finds in the cynic's name Apemantus, which is sometimes spelt *Apermantus* in the Folio. This spelling, noted before by Fleay and Wright, is highly significant, as it appears only in the scenes attributed to Day's collaborator.

Mr. Sykes has attempted to identify the two authors of the early play and finds Day's hand unmistakable in the Timon-Apemantus parts. He draws many parallels between these scenes and Day's *Humour out of Breath*: a grammatical peculiarity, the abundance of empty quibbles having the appearance of wit, the short snappy Timon-Apemantus dialogues; these rapid brief speeches and the continuous fire of questions and answers are found nowhere outside Day's plays. The other non-Shakespearean scenes

<sup>1)</sup> Columbia University Press, 1910.

bear, as Mr. Sykes shows, indubitable marks of Middleton's workmanship. In a brief paper in *Notes and Queries*<sup>1)</sup> Mr. W. Wells had already suggested the claims of Middleton to the non-Shakespearean scenes. Middleton's hand is especially evident in the two first scenes of the third act; the abundance of rime, the irregular, unscannable verse lines, the frequent and aimless shifts from verse to prose are the clearest evidence of his authorship. Mr. Sykes produces moreover a list of characteristic expressions from Middleton's plays occurring in these scenes of *Timon of Athens*. The name *Apermantus* is a great support here. The last part of the paper is taken up by determining how much of the play is Shakespeare's and how much belongs to the original play attributed to Day and Middleton, and the division between the portions written by each author. Mr. Sykes's conclusion makes the play another interesting example of Shakespeare's practice of using an earlier play of lesser known dramatists for a revision.

One of the most important essays in the book is the second paper on the authorship of *The Taming of a Shrew*. The play, which appeared anonymously, has been ascribed in turns to Marlowe, to Greene, to Kyd, and in part to Shakespeare himself, but all on insufficient evidence. *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, also published anonymously, was ascribed to the actor Tarlton, unsupported by any evidence. Mr. Sykes detects two hands in *A Shrew*; the original humorist, the writer of the rough realistic prose of the induction, interludes and boisterous comedy scenes, could not be one and the same person as the author of the polished artificial verse, the imitator of Marlowe. Mr. Sykes was struck by a passage in the additions to *Dr. Faustus* that is closely paralleled in *A Shrew*, and on investigating the matter came to the conclusion that the prose scenes of *A Shrew* and the prose additions to *Dr. Faustus* are the work of the same hand. We know from external evidence that William Birde and Samuel Rowley were the authors of the additions to *Dr. Faustus*. S. Rowley is the author of *When You See Me You Know Me, or The Famous Chronicle History of King Henry the Eight*, a play which bears an obvious resemblance to *The Famous Victories of Henry V*; the affinity had already been noted by Sir Sidney Lee,<sup>2)</sup> and Mr. Sykes adduces much conclusive evidence by a list of parallel phrases occurring in the two plays to prove this theory. He further shows the affinity between the speeches of Will Summers and the clowning scenes in *Dr. Faustus*, *A Shrew* and *The Famous Victories*, and comes to the interesting conclusion that the same hand created Will Summers, Sander and Dericke. The prose scenes of the comedy *Wily Beguiled* are also assigned to Rowley by Mr. Sykes.

The essay is of special interest for the light it throws on the figure and career of Samuel Rowley. A list of all the plays in which this dramatist was concerned is added; Mr. Sykes rejects *The Noble Soldier*, and fixes the date of *The Famous Victories* c. 1588, the year in which Tarlton, who acted the part of Dericke, died; in this way Rowley's career is dated back twelve or thirteen years. From a less substantial figure in the history of the Elizabethan drama this playwright receives new distinction as an original humorist excelling as a creator of clowns, whose most valuable legacy to the English stage is Sander in *The Taming of a Shrew*. Mr. Sykes quotes Swinburne's fine tribute to this dramatist: "All the force and humour alike of character and situation belong to Shakespeare's eclipsed and forlorn

<sup>1)</sup> 12 S. vi (1920), 266.

<sup>2)</sup> *Life of Shakespeare*.

precursor; he (Shakespeare) has added nothing; he has tempered and enriched everything".

It is certainly not the least of Mr. Sykes's merits as a critic to have established the identity of this 'eclipsed and forlorn precursor' as Samuel Rowley's.

The title of the third paper "Peele's *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*" will probably surprise some readers, but most critics have regarded Moseley's attribution of the play to Chapman with suspicion; early tradition had assigned *Alphonsus* to Peele's hand. Mr. Sykes shows in his examination of the play that the end-stopped lines, archaic phrasing and vocabulary point to a date within a few years of 1590 or thereabouts. He undertakes a comparison of the play with Peele's authentic works, pointing out striking parallelisms of phrasing; to illustrate the resemblance in diction and movement of verse extracts are printed from *Alphonsus*, *The Battle of Alcazar* and *Edward I.* The origin of *Alphonsus* is particularly interesting from the historical point of view; the decision arrived at is that Peele is the sole author of the play, but that it may have undergone some revision at a later date.

In the next paper Mr. Sykes offers an interesting examination of Dekker's style, his use of metaphors, his mannerisms and his keen appreciation of music. *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy*, recorded in Henslowe's *Diary*, February 1599, by Thomas Dekker, William Haughton and John Day has never come down to us. The play *Lust's Dominion, or The Lascivious Queen*, published in 1657 and attributed on the title page to Christopher Marlowe, is identified as the lost play by some critics, but others have rejected this theory. By evidence of parallels in vocabulary and sentiment with Dekker's plays, in particular with *Old Fortunatus*, Mr. Sykes proves conclusively Dekker's controlling hand in *Lust's Dominion*, and establishes the identity of this play with the lost *Spanish Moor's Tragedy*.

The next three papers show Mr. Sykes's profound study of Webster's plays. The essay "Webster's *Appius and Virginia*: A Vindication" appears here for the first time. The publisher Moseley's attribution of *Appius and Virginia* to Webster in 1659 cannot be accepted as conclusive, and the marked difference with Webster's other plays has puzzled many critics. The late Mr. Rupert Brooke has denied Webster's authorship and assigned the play to Thomas Heywood, Webster's share being confined to a slight revision of only two scenes.<sup>1)</sup> Mr. Sykes has undertaken the task to vindicate Webster's claim to the authorship of this play, and we must admit that he has been highly successful in the attempt.

Mr. Sykes begins by pointing out that many traces of Heywood's vocabulary also occur in Webster's undoubtedly plays, as Webster was an inveterate borrower, so this is no justification for discrediting Webster's authorship. Heywood's influence is undeniable in Webster's later plays but not so marked as Shakespeare's; Mr. Sykes shows that other influences, for example that of Sidney's *Arcadia*, can also be traced in *The Devil's Law Case* and *Appius and Virginia*. His opinion is that resemblance of language and sentiments with Webster's other plays furnishes more important evidence, so he gives a list of repetitions, striking parallel phrases and some passages showing a remarkable likeness of manner and spirit with *The Duchess of Malfy*, *The White Devil* and *The Devil's Law Case*. A conclusive proof is the trial scene of *The White Devil* returning as a conspicuous and successful

<sup>1)</sup> *John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama*, London, 1916.

feature in *The Devil's Law Case* and in *Appius and Virginia*. The date of the play is fixed not earlier than 1630 or thereabouts. The evidence adduced by Mr. Sykes leads to the final settlement of the question; the conclusion that the play is Webster's and that Heywood had no hand in it is incontestable.

*The Fair Maid of the Inn*, licensed on 22<sup>nd</sup> of January 1626, was printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647. The play, which has been attributed to Massinger with some help of Rowley, is here assigned to Massinger and Webster. Mr. Sykes's attribution is the more remarkable as it has never been suspected before that Webster collaborated with Massinger. In a footnote Mr. Sykes corrects his own view as to the first scene of Act IV, which he now (1924) assigns to Ford, and adds that there are traces of Ford's hand elsewhere in the play. It is interesting to note that many passages are pointed out to be borrowings from Sidney's *Arcadia* and Overbury's *Characters*. A passage:

"Clown. When a dove-house is empty, there is cummin-seed used to purloin from the rest of the neighbours."<sup>1)</sup>

is traced back to Overbury's *Characters*, where we find of 'An Host':

"His wife is the cummin-seed of his dove-house, and to be a good guest is a warrant for her liberty."<sup>2)</sup>

Has it escaped Mr. Sykes's notice that a passage occurs in *The Spanish Gipsy* expressing the same idea? In the second scene, Act II, Pretiosa says:

"Am I a pigeon, think you, to be caught with cummin-seeds?"

Webster may have borrowed the idea from this play or, if this scene in *The Spanish Gipsy* is to be assigned to Ford,<sup>3)</sup> this parallel might serve as another indication of Ford's hand in *The Fair Maid of the Inn*.

After noting more indications of Webster's authorship Mr. Sykes arrives at the conclusion that the larger part of the play including the character of the 'Fair Maid' herself is Webster's.

In the following papers John Ford's work is discussed. *The Queen, or The Excellency of her Sex* was published anonymously in 1653 and reprinted in 1906 in *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*<sup>4)</sup> by Professor Bang, who ascribed the play to Ford. Mr. Sykes has studied Ford's plays closely, and adducing more conclusive evidence of vocabulary and parallel phrases, proves that Ford's authorship is unquestionable.

The attribution of *The Spanish Gipsy* substantially, if not wholly, to Ford will be rather startling to the reader. Mr. Sykes first speaks of the external evidence. The play was printed in 1653 for Richard Marriott, thirty years after the first recorded performance and twenty-six years after Middleton's death. He points out that the publication with Middleton's and Rowley's names on the title page argues nothing, as Marriott was an untrustworthy publisher; "the attribution of a late publisher alone ought never to be accepted in the absence of corroborative internal evidence", is Mr. Sykes's theory. As regards the internal evidence he traces Ford's hand in the double-rimed couplet at the end of a scene; this use is characteristic of Ford and does not occur in Middleton's plays. He goes on indicating Ford's hand in the vocabulary, phrasing and imagery, as for example, the hour-glass metaphor:

<sup>1)</sup> Act. III, sc. ii.

<sup>2)</sup> ed. Rimbault, 1890, p. 71.

<sup>3)</sup> See below.

<sup>4)</sup> Vol. XIII.

"The glass of misery  
Is, after many a change of desperate fortune,  
At length run out;"<sup>1)</sup>

which reappears in *The Witch of Edmonton* (Ford's share),<sup>2)</sup> *The Sun's Darling*<sup>3)</sup> and *The Broken Heart*.<sup>4)</sup>

Mr. Sykes admits that the gipsy scenes are more difficult to assign, as Ford's style is less clearly traceable in the prose comedy scenes; he has, however, attempted to prove that Ford's hand can be traced in every scene. I cannot immediately subscribe to the conclusion that the play is wholly Ford's; the discussion of the authorship involves a problem about which there is not enough decisive evidence. I would rather accept Mr. Sykes' suggestion that the gipsy scenes have been revised or rewritten by some other dramatist. The humour of these scenes, and those in which Sancho and Soto appear, are unlike anything in Ford's compositions, which are notable for their lack of comic power.

Field's share in the Beaumont and Fletcher plays is discussed in the last paper. The characteristic features of Field's verse are not easily recognised, since this author's style has much in common with Beaumont's, so that Beaumont has been credited with much work in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio that ought to be reclaimed for Field. Mr. Sykes proves that Field collaborated in *The Queen of Corinth* and *The Knight of Malta*, and assigns the two first 'Triumphs' with the Induction of *The Four Plays in One*, assumed to be Beaumont's, to Field. He thinks it very probable that the *Four Plays* were not written until after Beaumont's death.

In the Appendix Mr. Sykes states briefly his views concerning the authorship of a number of other Elizabethan and Jacobean plays, which makes us express the hope that we may look forward to another collection of fascinating essays, in which this keen-eyed critic will offer detailed discussions of some of these plays with the usual abundance of interesting notes and suggestive remarks; they will surely be warmly welcomed by all students interested in this subject.

Amsterdam.

W. P. FRIJLINCK.

MARIO PRAZ, *Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra. John Donne—Richard Crashaw.* — Firenze. "La Voce" 1925.

The new Italian school of English Studies, of which Signor Praz gives an interesting history and description on another page, is already producing remarkable results, and its contemporary historian himself seems to be one of its most promising disciples. Apart from a solitary article in the *Modern Language Review* we have never come across his name yet; but the splendid volume that bears the above title, at once lays all students of English literature under a heavy obligation. In the first place it contains a new life of Richard Crashaw and of John Donne, superseding all earlier biographies. This is no scant praise. But greater importance even attaches to its main

<sup>1)</sup> V, iii.

<sup>2)</sup> V, i.

<sup>3)</sup> V, i.

<sup>4)</sup> III, v.

object: a critical analysis of the work of the two "Metaphysicals" from a specifically Italian point of view.

At no time was the influence of Italian literature and Italian art stronger or more widely felt than round about 1600, when Italian artists and poets were celebrated and imitated, and Italian manuals of style were used in schools, all over Western Europe. We can never hope to obtain an adequate view of that period without the assistance of Italian criticism. It was the time of the Baroque.

If I am not mistaken the Italian word *Secentismo* has come to express the same idea as our *Baroque*. The Italian word seems preferable in some respects. I do not think it has such unpleasant associations as our word, which is still current to denote anything extravagant or grotesque. At some time in the future "Baroque" may develop in the same way as "Gothic" developed in the past. It may become a neutral term, used only for convenience, to indicate one well-defined fashion of art and culture, without implying abuse or reproach. The clearness of our historical perspective will gain by such development. But we have not yet reached that stage. We have outgrown Burckhardt's antipathy against everything Baroque, as Burckhardt himself outgrew it, only too late. Wölfflin and others even made the Baroque almost fashionable again, as all historical styles were apt to become fashionable in the nineteenth century. But our notions of the historical Baroque as a whole have certainly not become well-defined. We are far removed as yet from any thorough understanding of the essence of *Secentismo*. We know some of its outward appearances in architecture and sculpture, and we call them imposing but extravagant. But what do we really know of the spirit that was behind these seeming extravagances? What in particular do we know of its manifestations in literature? Professor Brom has written quite a scholarly little book on *Barok en Romantiek*, but it could almost be quoted to prove that Baroque has hardly revealed its mysteries yet even to its professed students. One is inclined to wonder if our present generation has really succeeded in gaining that detachment which is indispensable for an objective view of the Seicento. Are its traces perhaps lingering on in our minds without our knowing it?

It is mainly on account of such doubts that we must welcome Italian and other foreign critics into our province of studies. They may be free at least from some of our Northern prejudices. Even if — or rather just because — we are quite prepared to find in them some peculiar prejudices of their own.

One prejudice is contained in the very name which the Italians give to what we call the Baroque period. "Secentismo" may be free from the emotional colouring of our "Baroque", it implies a chronological connotation by which it will be somewhat difficult to remain undisturbed. For it sounds almost like a paradox to say that *Secentismo* began before the seventeenth century, and that its heyday was over long before the eighteenth century had begun.

Another obstacle to the objectivity of Italian views of the Seicento lies in the fact that the eighteenth century, which, as is often the case, looked down upon its immediate, predecessor with more disdain than upon any others, coined "spagnolismo" as an abusive synonym of "secentismo" and consequently gave rise to hot and passionate controversies as to the origin of this "aberration from good taste".<sup>1)</sup> The cinders of these controversies

<sup>1)</sup> It is not generally known that the idea and the word "good taste" itself with its various parallels in different languages, was in all probability a product of the Seicento.

which are as sterile and interminable as those raging at present in France about romanticism, are not yet quite extinguished. No less a critic than Professor Croce has pointed at "un po' di boria nazionale" in these disputes, and has shown that they may tend "na suffocare ogni germe di verità".<sup>2)</sup>

In selecting two authors that both wrote in the beginning of the seventeenth century, Signor Praz runs no risk of falling into the first error. And all students of English literature will profit by his acute analysis of the works of Donne and Crashaw. Not those of English literature alone. For the two authors are highly typical of their time. That curious mixture of scholastic medievalism and Renaissance humanism found in Donne, and Crashaw's Marinism and "Jemitism" is a symptom of a mode of thinking that was prevalent in other literatures as well. Dutch students will experience hardly any qualms of patriotic conscience in calling Vondel — for all his good-humoured antipathy against "De Britse Donn' Die duistre zon" — a Baroque poet, though most Frenchmen would hesitate to apply the term to Corneille. But I do not know if it has been observed before that the celebrated chorus:

O Kerstnacht, schooner dan de dagen, is thoroughly Marinistic in conception. — Even the critical editors of Maria Tesselschade's poems have not noticed that.

Een zingendt vedertje en een ghewieckt gheluydt is a literal translation from Marino's

Una piuma canora, un canto alabo<sup>3).</sup>

Marinismo is only one of the aspects of literary Secentismo, though a significant one perhaps and certainly the one easiest to identify. But Signor Praz sometimes seems to take the two terms as synonymous. After demonstrating that Crashaw's poetry is saturated with all the sensuousness and the conceits of the true Marinist, he concludes by saying that it contains "l'essenza di tutto il Seicento".

In working up to this climax, the Author is probably led by "Un po' di boria nazionale". For Crashaw must be more Marinistic than Marino himself, if we are to maintain that "Un poeta italiano... non poteva esser secentesco che a metà" (p. 270 s.). This is getting dangerously near that second pitfall against which Croce had warned him.

He seems to regard the Baroque with feelings somewhat similar to those with which Charles Maurras and his followers fight against Romanticism. He controls his feelings with admirable and scholarly restraint. But he insists again and again on the theory that the Baroque style was not an exaggeration, a degeneration or a development of the Renascence; that it was and only could be the product of the Gothic mind superficially touched by the Renascence influence, that it was indeed: the Gothic style carried to extremes.

It is an unquestionable and unquestioned fact that Gothic style has never struck root in Italy. The Renascence on the other hand is essentially and exclusively Italian; in all other countries its products usually betray themselves at once as articles of foreign import. The Author accounts for these facts in his own poetical way. It was "il sostrato, il presupposto del culto dei classici" that was lacking elsewhere. And this substratum, this presupposition, present only in Italy, was: "l'ombra di Roma, fermento sempre operante nello spirito italiano, quale un mito vitale e sofferto. nostalgia d'età dell'oro, rimpianto di Paradiso perduto, ansia di Terra promessa" (p. 112).

<sup>2)</sup> *Saggi sulla Letteratura Italiana del Seicento* (Bari Laterza 1911), p. 190.

<sup>3)</sup> See DR. J. A. WORP—J. F. M. STERCK, *Een Onwaerdeerlyck Vrouw* ('s-Hage), p. 92. G. MARINO, *L'Adone*, ed. G. Zirardini (Parigi 1849), p. 111.

But he opens even wider vistas by proposing two parallel lines of development. In Italy the natural course of evolution led from Romanic art to the Renascence, and from the Renascence to Classicism. Outside Italy, however, in Spain and France as well as in the North, the first stage of art was Gothic, and Gothicism led to Baroque, and Baroque led to Romanticism. The Italian development is the development of idealism; the other the development of realism.

The Author is fully aware that these are bold generalizations. They are directly expressed only in one passage (p. 113), but they have certainly been at the back of his mind all through his studies.

It would be easy to raise a hundred objections against it. No city is more Baroque than the capital of Italy; Signor Praz himself finds the "epitome dello spirito religioso del Seicento" in a notorious marble group by Bernini (p. 145); and Bernini was an Italian, as Marino was an Italian.

But it cannot be denied that the idea is extremely suggestive and that it imparts colour and warmth and life to the whole book. So probably the Author will complacently allow a Northerner to call this a prejudice. I am not quite sure, however, but that it is exactly this prejudice that constitutes the great value of the Author's contribution to the criticism of English literature. No Northerner could have taken up such a standpoint. It is well that an Italian should come to turn his own lights on the Baroque. One prejudice may counterbalance another. A controversy on such questions would probably suffocate "ogni germe di verità"! A complex phenomenon must be studied from different standpoints. By comparing different results we may gradually get at the truth. And so Signor Praz is welcome to his own standpoint. His penetrating analyses and criticisms, even his sweeping generalizations, expressed with a fervour calculated to carry conviction, will be of great help for every student to deepen his insight, not only into this Seicento-phenomenon but into the whole theory of art. They will at the very least give him food for thought on some of the great problems of Comparative Literature.

Nijmegen.

FR. A. POMPEN, O.F.M.

---

*George Eliots Beziehungen zu Deutschland.* Von SIBILLA PFEIFFER.  
Anglistische Forschungen, herausgegeben von Dr. Johannes Hoops.  
Heidelberg 1925, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung; c. 300 pag.

It is the writer's intention — so she says in the Preface to this dissertation — to show what was the attitude of England towards German literature, German art and German tendencies in general before and during George Eliot's life-time, and to conclude from this in how far her appreciation of the great Germans was conventional and in how far personal.

In the first chapter (*I Momente die George Eliot auf das Deutschtum verwiesen*) we read how the Germans, first looked upon by the English as creatures of coarser make, gradually rose in their opinion and finally came to be judged at what was approximately the right value. In my opinion this part — which covers 76 pages — might have been more succinct, especially since a good treatment of the same subject, though different in many ways,

had already appeared in an earlier German thesis.<sup>1)</sup> I was surprised, too, to find Germany represented throughout as the maturer country, the country specially favoured by the Muses and able to benefit any nation if it could only take the gifts, without an acknowledgement being made of the great debt that an earlier generation of Germans owed to England. The following passage is characteristic :

Das aber ist eines der Hauptverdienste der englischen Romantik, dasz sie dem Interesse für Deutschland einen neuen Impuls gab, dasz man begann, es genauer zu studieren, um seinem Wesen näher zu kommen."

In 1b (*George Eliots Freundeskreis*) there is the same wish to be exhaustive, to say all. And saying all is always saying too much. Five pages are devoted to Sara Austin's relations to Germany, her appreciation of Goethe, of the great composers; rather more than eight to Matthew Arnold's; passages of various length to Newman, Robert Fellowes, Thackeray, Tennyson, Browning, Thomas Hood, Disraeli, etc. etc., all of whom find themselves cosily united in George Eliot's „Freundeskreis”.

The second chapter treats of *George Eliots Stellung zu deutschen kulturellen Verhältnissen*. Her different journeys to Germany are taken separately, and many quotations are made from her letters and journal. I cannot help thinking that the fierce light that beats upon the great should be now and then tempered or quite extinguished; nor do I believe it is paying homage to George Eliot (poor great woman, where can you find shelter?) to seek out and unearth, after seventy years, her often very ordinary remarks upon German villages, German food, or German local costumes, and clothe them with an importance and dignity which they never possessed.

In the next chapter (*G. E.s Verhältnis zur deutschen Sprache*) Fräulein Pfeiffer expresses her admiration of the Englishwoman's thorough knowledge of the foreign language and her fine linguistic feeling, which enabled her to translate so accurately and to study the German authors and philosophers so thoroughly. To my mind, this chapter is again spoilt by a profusion of uninteresting detail :

„Was geographische Namen betrifft, so gibt George Eliot zuweilen die Deutsche, zuweilen auch die englische Bezeichnung, z. b. Nürnberg, Salzburg usw., aber Frankfort, Munich usw. Nur einmal, bei der Erwähnung Triers, wählt sie den französischen Namen Trèves, obwohl ihr eine englische Bezeichnung zur Verfügung stand“..... „In ihren Schriften gebraucht George Eliot bei der Anrede Deutscher im allgemeinen das deutsche „Herr“, nur zuweilen stezt sie das englische „Mr.“ Spricht sie von einer verheirateten Deutschen Dame, so sagt sie „Madame“ oder „Frau“; unverheiratete Damen lässt sie in deutscher Weise mit „Fräulein“ anreden“..... „Was die deutsche Komposita angeht, so scheint sie zuweilen in Zweifel ob sie die einzeln Glieder durch Bindestriche aneinanderknüpfen soll oder nicht, oder ob das Ganze als ein ungetrenntes Wort oder jedes Glied des Kompositums als unabhängiges Wort zu betrachten ist. Sie schreibt daher: „auf einander“, „Juden-Gasse“ und „Juden Gasse“. (Allerdings könnte in diesem Falle das Fehlen des Bindestrichs als Druckfehler zu betrachten sein.)“

The beginning of *George Eliots Beziehungen zum deutschen Geistesleben* is more interesting reading; her growing sympathy with Goethe, Heine, her admiration of German philosophy and German music are illustrated by many remarks from various writings. The novels are also laid under contribution, although I do not know if Mordecai's going to Göttingen and Rosamund's singing German songs is very significant in this connexion.

<sup>1)</sup> Werner Leopold, *Die religiöse Wurzel von Carlyles literarischer Wirksamkeit*, Halle a. S. Max Niemeyer, 1922. The book is probably unknown to the writer, for it is not mentioned in the bibliography, which is one of those (nearly six pages of small print) which frighten the timid reader.

The last two chapters (*V. Verhältnis zur deutschen Politik, VI. Ergebnis*,) are, I think, the feeblest part of the book. For impartial as Sibilla Pfeiffer is in her quotings, she is not so in her comment upon the quotations. It will not do to consider a person a competent judge so long as he praises what we praise, and to call him prejudiced as soon as he differs from us in opinion.

„We see a king who, (she quotes from George Eliot) while opening something like a parliament, boasted of unimpaired absolutism, and who has, even after the revolution of 1848, never missed an opportunity of intimating that he does not recognise any material alteration. We observe a system of centralization interfering with the most minute details of local affairs and the most sacred interests of the individual”, „alles Dinge (the writer adds), deren Uebertreibung die Entrüstung der freiheitgewohnten Engländerin beweist....” „In allen politischen Dingen folgt sie ziemlich kritiklos der Englischen Tradition, die sich seit der Zeit Friedrich II immer wieder mit Deutschland beschäftigt....”

The writer, in the *Ergebnis*, tries to find out how it was that the German spirit did not, after all, stir the English authoress to the deepest depths. She attributes this partly to the fact that the English, since the Middle Ages, had looked upon the French ideals of culture as the higher and nobler.

„Und schlieszlich war George Eliot eben George Eliot, das heiszt, ihr war eine gewisse Neigung des Willens eigen, sich dem einmal als für sie richtig und gut Erkannten ganz hinzugeben und mit einer gewissen Starrheit und Zähigkeit daran festzuhalten, selbst unter bewussten Nichtachtung einer neuen Erkenntnis. Daher kam es, dasz es für sie überhaupt schwer war, sich in Neues hineinzufinden, und es spricht für die Grösze und Gewalt dessen, was Deutschland ihr zu bieten hatte, dasz sie sich mit dem Deutschen so intensiv befaszt hat.”

S. Pfeiffer has a pleasant and clear style and the way she treats the subject is thorough and scholarly. Yet, though respecting her great knowledge and *Belesenheit*, I believe that, in her literary studies, she has struck into the wrong path. Her chauvinism is rather obtrusive sometimes; but that is beside the question. She has a great capacity for taking pains; can it be because she gives us so little that has come to her without pains that we close the book with a sense of coming home empty-handed? And here I am reminded of Iolo Williams<sup>1)</sup> who, as a lover of literature, is at the opposite pole to Fr. Pfeiffer.

“My reader”, he says (p. 41) after quoting a poem by Langhorne, “may here accuse me of inconsistency in the matter of printing e's or apostrophes in past participles and in such words as “flower” (or “flow'r'”); the discrepancy is due to my indolence, I fear, for I copy the poems in this little book as they are before me; where I have an edition with the author's original spelling and punctuation in my study, I copy that. In other cases I take any edition I happen to have — through I suppose that, if I were conscientious, I should go to the British Museum, armed with a reader's ticket, and copy all my quotations from the first editions; only really, dear reader, I cannot be bothered (or bother'd).”

Of course you ought to have gone to the British Museum! the dear reader mentally replies. But he easily forgives Iolo Williams. He sees him sitting among his favourite books with a very happy face; how can he leave them for the sake of what to him is unessential? And the thought crosses the reader's mind that Iolo Williams is nearer than the German student to *das, worauf es ankommt.*

A. C. E. VECHTMANN-VETH.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Iolo A. Williams, *By-ways round Helicon*. London, Heinemann, 1922.

## Current Letters and Philology.

### 1. Criticism and Biography.

One of the most noteworthy events of a crowded season was the publication of the late Amy Lowell's *Life of Keats* (London. J. Cape). Prophesying about the fate of new books is notoriously hazardous, but we have no hesitation in predicting, that these two volumes will prove of more than ephemeral value. Even by sheer weight of facts and details the new biography commands attention. A large part of it is of course based on the work of forerunners, but it also gives evidence of unusually painstaking original research; the author had formed a very rich collection of Keatsiana, she had access to other little known sources of information and so she has added several interesting particulars to our knowledge of the poet's life and personality. Moreover she has succeeded in embodying the numerous data in a lively, graphic, well-constructed narrative, which also contains a series of clever psychological portraits of Keats's friends and relatives. The historical background is painted with surprising vivacity; the book gives a clear, intimate view of various aspects of the social and literary life of the period. It is very long, too long as a matter of fact — nearly 1200 pages — and notably the immense disquisition on *Endymion*, which in spite of its length throws hardly any new light on the poem, should have been cut down to more modest proportions, but the biographical parts are nowhere tedious. It is illustrated with 36 beautiful reproductions of portraits, documents etc. some of which had never been published before.

Students of Keats have more to be thankful for this year, for exactly that part of Miss Lowell's work which is not quite satisfactory and here and there decidedly weak: the aesthetic criticism, the interpretation of the poet's work has been taken up by one of the most competent English critics of the present time. Mr. J. Middleton Murry's book *Keats and Shakespeare*. (London. Oxford Univ. Press 1925) forms a very valuable complement to Miss Lowell's exhaustive biography. Its theme is the growth of the poet's mind, as revealed in his work and his amazingly modern letters. Mr. Middleton Murry has treated it with his characteristic courage and sincerity. He comes to the conclusion, that the affinity between Shakespeare and Keats is much closer than has hitherto been assumed and that Keats consciously strove to emulate the great master. It is an original and profound work and there are several really beautiful, elucidating passages on the essential qualities of the 'pure poetic mind' and on the aim and spirit of poetry in general. A kindred subject was treated some time ago by Lascelles Abercrombie in a series of lectures, now published in book-form. (*The Idea of Great Poetry*. Martin Secker). The author assumes that "great poetry is somehow recognizable" and goes on to ask what that recognition involves and how it is made. The quest naturally leads to various knotty, much discussed problems: definitions of poetry, the difference between fancy and imagination, the relation between form and substance, the question whether it is the idea in a poem or what is done with it which is of greater importance etc. On all these points the lecturer has very suggestive remarks to make; the whole treatise, a model of clear, sound argumentation, is eminently readable and will certainly contribute to a better understanding, a keener appreciation of the essentials of great poetry and of art in general. Among the poets specially referred to are Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Dante, Wordsworth, Goethe, the comparison between Shelley and Leopardi is very instructive.

In a series of short chapters written in a purposely plain, frequently pugnacious style Mr. I. A. Richards has laid down his *Principles of Literary Criticism* (Kegan Paul). The author, dissatisfied with the methods employed by critics from Aristotle to the present day, tries to raise or reduce criticism to a science. A similar attempt was made years ago by Professor Moulton and a few followers. In an excellent article Mr. J. H. Schutt has shown us the poor, unsatisfactory results Prof. Moulton's inordinate industry has yielded. (E.S. Vol. VI. p. 200). But Mr. Richards is a deeper thinker, a subtler dialectician. And although his main assumption is, we think, untenable and there is little unity or coherence in his book, it is well worth reading. For it is full of shrewd observations, interesting comparisons and side-thrusts at received opinion that demand consideration. Much of its space is devoted to a treatise on modern psychology and an inquiry into the real value of literature and art.

We also received a curious little volume on Shelley: E. Carpenter and G. Barnefield *The Psychology of the Poet Shelley* (Allen & Unwin). It contains two separate essays, for Mr. Carpenter has required nearly fifty pages for his "few lines by way of introduction", whereas the essay proper by Mr. Barnefield covers fifty-one.

It is, we think, the first time Shelley has undergone the ordeal of psycho-analytical examination. He comes out of it as a sexual invert. The evidence seems to me but

slender and the interpretation of some parts of the poet's work rather fanciful. Mr. Barnefield himself has indeed been constrained to make an important reservation: Shelley was all his life ignorant of his own disposition. But he adds with great confidence: "There can be little doubt that if Shelley had survived a few more years his true nature would have forced itself into his conscious recognition".

Two publications in connection with the death of Joseph Conrad deserve special mention. Ford Madox Hueffer, Conrad's intimate friend and collaborator for a good many years has written reminiscences of the master from the day on which he first made his acquaintance. (F. M. Ford, *Joseph Conrad*. London. Duckworth, 1924) They are of exceptional value for our knowledge of the personality and the artistic ideals of the great novelist and give a lively picture of certain phases of his life. It has been said, that the book reads like a novel. We agree, if the comparison is meant to allude to a serious, highly interesting novel. It is a real work of art with fine graphic descriptions and penetrating psychological observations. In the concluding chapters the author deals with the art of novel-writing and more particularly with the methods employed by Conrad and himself when they worked together.

Very valuable too is the extra number of "*La Nouvelle Revue Française*" entirely devoted to Joseph Conrad. (Décembre 1924, 4 fr. 50). It is a book of nearly 200 pages with several illustrations and contains a series of souvenirs, essays on the work, some French letters of Conrad etc. Among the contributors are: John Galsworthy, André Gide, Richard Curle, Cunningham Graham, André Chevrillon, A. Maurois, Paul Valéry, Edmond Jaloux.

Nov. 1925.

A. G. v. K.

### Brief Mentions.

*Putnams' Word Book. A Practical Aid in Expressing Ideas through the Use of an Exact and Varied Vocabulary.* By LOUIS A. FLEMMING. Second Edn., Revised and Enlarged. Fcap. 8vo.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$  pp. 719 Putnams, 10s net.

This volume needs little introduction. It is a guide and reference-book containing upwards of 100,000 words so classified that practically any word desired is instantly accessible. By turning to the word that is thought of first or to the term with which the word that is wanted is associated and reading the collections there presented any word that may be desired will be found. No attempt has been made, however, to differentiate between the synonyms. — P. J. H. O. S.

---

*Words and Idioms. Studies in the English language.* By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. Pp. xi + 300. Constable, 1925. 7/6 net.

This is not a mere dry-as-dust catalogue of words and phrases, but in every sense of the term a scholarly and literary production. Mr. Smith, who will be remembered as the author of that attractive little volume *The English Language* in the *Home University Library*, has treated a subject dull in itself in a thoroughly interesting way, handling English idioms as pegs on which to hang historical and literary teaching. Especially interesting to students of English literature is Chapter III, an essay on the four great words *originality, creation, genius and romantic*. A Frenchman might take exception to so uncomplimentary a phrase as 'to take French leave' but should remember that his own language supplies an exact parallel in 'filer à l'anglaise'. The Dutch too, come in for some hard knocks (p. 221.). Among trade-coinings we find *celluloid* and *linoleum*, but no mention is made of the word *vaseline* coined by Mr. R. A. Chesebrough some fifty years ago as a registered trade-mark of the substance which he named petroleum-jelly. The first entry in O.E.D. is dated 1874. — P. J. H. O. S.

*A Shakespeare Reference Library.* By SIR SIDNEY LEE and SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS. (Second Edition.)  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 18 pp. For the English Association. Milford, 1925. 2s. 6d. n.

The first edition of this pamphlet was published in 1910. The choice of books is limited to those generally useful for the advanced study of Shakespeare; monographs on individual plays are excluded — a large omission. Among 'Dictionaries' no mention is made of Kellner's *Shakespeare-Wörterbuch*, though his *Restoring Shakespeare* is included under 'Problems of Text and Composition'. There is unconscious irony in the note on Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik*: 'A somewhat more elaborate effort on the lines laid down by Dr. Abbott. The work has not been translated into English'. In view of the class of student for whom this Bibliography seems intended, the abridged edition of Franz's book might have been mentioned. *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy* by F. L. Lucas had better been omitted (see M. S. v., 41), and the treatises on the subject by Cunliffe and Charlton given instead. Holland is represented by Van Dam and Stoffel, *William Shakespeare. Prosody and Text* ['Theories open to much criticism']; and by a reference to studies in this Journal. — Z.

## Bibliography.

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*The Comic Spirit in Restoration Drama.* Studies in the comedy of Etherege, Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar. By HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 149 pp. Newhaven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 1925. 9s. n.

*An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber, Comedian, and Late Patentee of the Theatre Royal.* Written by HIMSELF. In two Volumes.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I., xii. + 160 pp. Vol. II., 168 pp. Golden Cockerel Press. 1925. 36s. n.

*The Life of Samuel Johnson.* By JAMES BOSWELL, Esq. Edited with Notes by ARNOLD GLOVER. Three Volumes. Dent. 1925. 22s. 6d. n.

Another illustrated Boswell. This is a reprint of Mr. Glover's well-known edition first published in 1901. The text is that of Malone's sixth (and last) edition of 1811. [T.]

*William Blake: A Critical Essay.* By ALGERNON CHARLES SWIRNBURNE.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , xi. + 310 pp. Heinemann. 1925. 4s. n.

First published in 1868.

*William Blake in This World.* By HAROLD BRUCE.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , v. + 234 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1925. 12s. 6d. n.

*The Letters of Hannah More.* Selected with an introduction by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , ix. + 212 pp. John Lane. 1925. 6s. n.

*Washington Irving.* Ambassador at Large from the New World to the Old. By GEORGE S. HELLMAN.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xi. + 355 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1925. 16s. n.

*Keats as A Medical Student.* By SIR WILLIAM HALE-WHITE, K. B. E.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , pp. 249-262. Reprinted from "Guy's Hospital Reports," Vol. 75. Wakley and Son. 1925.

*Coleridge at Highgate.* By LUCY E. WATSON, 9 x 6, 196 pp. Longmans. 1925. 10s. 6d. n.

*Die sozialpolitischen Anschauungen Coleridges und sein Einfluss auf Carlyle.* Von NIKOLAUS SCHANCK. Pp. 91. Bonn, 1924. M. 250. [A review will appear.]

*The Letters of Thomas Manning to Charles Lamb.* Edited by G. A. ANDERSON.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , 159 pp. Martin Secker. 1925. 8s. 6d. n.

*The Story of the Brontës.* By J. C. WRIGHT.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 189 pp. Leonard Parsons. 1925. 5s. n.

*The Immortal Dickens.* By GEORGE GISSING.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 243 pp. Cecil Palmer. 1925. 6s. n.

*The Significance of Anthony Trollope.* By SPENCER VAN BOKKELEN NICHOLS. Edition limited to 490 copies. New York: Douglas C. McMurtrie.

*Character and Environment in the Novels of Thomas Hardy.* By H. B. GRIMSDITCH. London, Witherby, 1925. 6/- net.

*Notes on Joseph Conrad, with Some Unpublished Letters.* By ARTHUR SYMONS,  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ , 38 pp. Myers (102, New Bond-street, W. 1). 1925. 5s. n.

*Shaw.* By J. S. COLLIS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 192 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1925. 5s. n.

# Edmund Spenser and Jonker Jan van der Noot.

It is well known that the "Visions of Bellay" and of "Petrarch" included among Spenser's "Complaints" in 1591, are revised versions of poems that appeared in an English dress for the first time in the "Theatre of Worldlings" etc. (1569), which was in its turn the translation of a Dutch work<sup>1)</sup> written by Jonker Jan van der Noot (or Noodt), a Dutch poet who had taken refuge in London. That Spenser thus claimed these poems has led to a general belief that he must have had a hand in producing them, yet satisfactory proof of this remains a crux of literary scholarship. On the one side stand English and American scholars<sup>2)</sup> who refuse to believe that Spenser had "purloyned" another's poems and find moreover the character of the *Theatre* poems such as cannot but point to Spenser as the most likely author. And in this judgment Vermeylen, the Dutch biographer of v. d. Noot, has concurred.

Against this must be set Van der Noot's own definite statement that *he* had translated the poems from *Dutch* into English, a claim which the Dutch writer W. de Hoog supports on behalf of his countryman. But the belief in the Spenserian authorship of those verses has been most seriously challenged by Dr. E. Koeppel who, however, does not pretend to discover the real translator in question. The issue has thus been left undetermined and, although much ground has been cleared in the course of the controversy, remains obscure, to which result the half-true deductions and misstatements of many writers on the question have contributed not a little. Unfortunately, also, neither Grosart (who indeed did not know of the existence of the earlier *Theatre* version in Dutch) nor any other investigator seems to have paid proper attention to the Dutch text of which the French, the English, and the German (1572) versions are translations.<sup>3)</sup> L. S. Friedland (who appears to have read Vermeylen) says mistakenly: "for the poetry our Fleming had gone to French sources"<sup>4)</sup> and quotes from Neil Dodge to the same effect.

<sup>1)</sup> Via an intermediate French edition, published London 1568.

<sup>2)</sup> The following are some of the articles and books noticed in this paper:

1. D. N. B. under *Spenser*.
2. Englische Studien Vol. 15, 1891; Vol. 27, 1900, "Ueber die echtheit der *Visions of Petrarch*". Dr. E. Koeppel.
3. Spenser. *Works*. (Globe edition) Grosart, Vol. I appendix.
4. Spenser Poet. *Works* (Cambridge ed.) Neil Dodge. (appendix).
5. Spenser, "Poetical Works". E. de Selincourt. Introduction.
6. A. Vermeylen, "Leven en werken van Jonker Jan van der Noot".
7. Biographie Nationale de Belgique.
8. Mod. L. Notes vol. 13, Oct. 1898. J. B. Fletcher.
9. Journal of Eng. & G. Philology, Vol. XIII, J. B. Fletcher.
10. Journal of Eng. & G. Philology, Vol. XII, L. S. Friedland.
11. Athenaeum Jan.-June 1902, p. 595, Jusserand.
12. Revue de Littérature Comparée, Juil.-Sept. 1922. "Un poète errant....". Galland.
13. "Studien over de Nederlandsche en Eng. Taal en Letterkunde...." W. de Hoog.  
For the others see text.

<sup>3)</sup> In the French "Theatre" only the prose part and the four apocalyptic sonnets are translated (from Dutch into French), the other poems being simply reprinted from Marot and du Bellay.

<sup>4)</sup> To begin with the apocalyptic sonnets are original, although their matter is, of course, taken from Revelations, and secondly, v. d. Noot did not go to Marot as a "source" for his "epigrams" but to Petrarch, the original, as Vermeylen clearly shows (pp. 48-50) and as v. d. Noot says in his commentary.

Jusserand has tried to show that for the "epigrams" Marot is the original of the English versions, and indicates that one of the chief objections to believing Spenser to be the English translator (viz: that Spenser as a youth of 17 could hardly be credited with a sufficient knowledge of French and Italian) to be thereby removed. Koeppel's researches have led him to a similar conclusion as to the source of the English "Epigram" versions and to add emphatically: "an ein holländisches Zwischenglied ist demnach gar nicht zu denken". (Vol 15, p. 58.) But he admits that he did not consult the Dutch text!

My investigations have revealed that although the French unquestionably formed the working basis of translation for all the poetry into English, neither the Italian nor the Dutch remained entirely unconsulted, the latter version showing its influence in the "Bellay" sonnets especially, now serving to keep the English closer to the French, now to lead it away.

The following examples<sup>5)</sup> show that the Italian text was in some instances borne in mind.

Epigram I. line 3. The English version, in omitting Marot's "devant mes yeulx" and v. d. Noot's equivalent "voer my" (before me), agrees with the Italian: "onde cose vedea" etc. — line 14. Ital. "Sua dura sorte"; Fr. "sa destinee"; Dut. "heur misval"; Eng. "so hard a destinee". The English clearly follows the Italian even if it may have been attracted into the use and spelling "Destinee" of the French; for it is characteristic of the English translator to adopt, wherever possible, identical forms of words from the various texts before him (c. p. Koeppel E. S. Vol. 15.)

Epigram II, line 11. Neither Marot nor v. d. Noot has the Italian "asconde" (covered) which the English gives as "drownde".

Epigram III, line 2. Ital. "Lauro giovinette e schietto", Fr. "Laurier jeune". Dut. "groenen lauriere"; Eng. "Fresh and lusty Laurel tree".

line 11. { "Sodaine". (1569). —  
                  { "Sodden flash" (1591). Italian "subito" is introduced which neither Marot nor v. d. Noot has.

line 14. Ital. "Che simil ombra mai non si racquista".  
                  Fr. "Car plus telle umbre on ne recouvre en terre".  
                  Dut. "Want sulcken boom en vindt men in den lande".  
                  Eng. "For no such shadow shalbe had againe".

Italian and English agree in omitting "en terre"; "in den lande".

Epigram IV, line 7. Ital. "nebbia obscura"; "grand nue obscure"; "a dark cloud"; "wolcke nevelachtich onblye". English and Italian in agreement again.

Final quatrain, line 2. Ital. "Queste sei visioni..."; Fr. "Ces six grans visions"; Dut. "dees ses groote ghesichten"; Eng. "these same six visions".

The English translation, although very close to the French, is not therefore as inevitably drawn into Marot's deviations as Jusserand or Koeppel would have us believe. In some cases indeed the French text as well as the others, is ignored, e.g. Epigram 4 (at the end) where a whole line in French is

<sup>5)</sup> From considerations of space the examples are given in their shortest possible form. The reader therefore may find it necessary to refer to the full texts in question. The original of the "epigrams" is Petrarch's Canzone beginning: "Standomi un giorno solo alla fenestra" (III In Morte.... Laura).

left untranslated, or line 3, where Marot's: "Dans ce lieu frais tant excellent et cher" is represented by "whereto" in English.

Furthermore it must be noted that Marot naturally under the title of "Des visions de Petrarque", (to which Spenser reverted in 1591 with "The Visions of Petrarch") renders Petrarch's canzone as one continuous poem ("chanson") but v. d. N. in his Dutch Theatre divided it up making a sort of sonnet sequence of it under the novel title of "Epigrammen". In the French and the English "Theatre" editions the same divisions prevail as a result of v. d. Noot's arrangement. But the influence of v. d. Noot and his Dutch version does not stop here. To begin with, when the three later texts agree, a surprising literalness may be noticed in many cases, e.g.:

**E p i g r a m I.** Marot introduces "soubz un roc" and is faithfully echoed in both the Dutch and the English texts with "onder een roetse" and "under a rock". Similarly Marot's additions in this epigram, "belle" (in describing the hind); "chiens" instead of the Italian "Veltri" (greyhounds), and the epithet "egre" are reproduced alike in "schoone"; "honden"; "snel" by v. d. Noot, and in "faire"; "dogs"; "egre" by the English translator.

**E p i g r a m V.** Marot's rhetorical addition "Que diray plus" (for which the French "Theatre" text has "Que diray ie plus") is repeated "Wat segh ick mehr?"; "What say I more".

So in the "Bellay" "Sonnets" we are struck by the similitude of phrasing of the Dutch and the English. "S o n n e t" I.:

Qui m'appelant du nom dont ie me nomme

Noemende my by mynen naam.

And calling me by my proper name (1569)  
Which calling me by name. (1591)

A partial return is made to the French in 1591, it will be noticed.

"S o n n e t" II.

La pave fut de iaspe & d'esmeraude fine

Den vloer die was van Iaspe en Esmeraude,

The floor was Iaspis and of Esmeraude 1569.

The floor of Iaspe & Emeraude was dight — 1591.

An improvement 'and more Spenserian than the earlier rendering. So also we find "O vanite du monde"! echoed in "O werelts ydelheyt!" and "O worlds vainenesse!" But the English translator is not content with reiterating the Dutch phrasing, he must needs be drawn into Dutch renderings as well as phraseology and order. **E p i g r a m I.** I will not say that v. d. Noot's translation of "standomi alla fenestra" and Marot's "Estant a la fenestre" by "s y n d e" etc. has caused the English "being at my window", but *standing* is probably a better, or at least an alternative rendering.<sup>6)</sup> The 1572 German rendering is "lag".

**E p i g r a m II.** In the following the English clearly follows the Dutch and Italian in the second half of the line, and the French in the first.

<sup>6)</sup> Cotgrave. French—English Dictionary, (1611) gives Ester — *to stand* and Estant = *being, resting, standing upon his feet* etc.

E1 mar tranquillo e l'aura era soave  
 Doulx fut le vent, la mer paisible et coye  
 De zee was calm, de weer was still ende in ore,  
 Mild was the wind, calm seemed the sea to be.

**E p i g r a m VI.** The following instance is similar to the above:

Che mai nol penso, ch'i non arda e treme  
 Qu'en y songeant tousjours je brusle et tremble  
 Dat ick om heur denckende ende beve en brande  
 That in thinking on hir I burne and quake.

Eng. "Thinking" probably follows Dutch "denckende", its exact equivalent, for "songeant" <sup>7)</sup> is here better rendered by *musing, dreaming* etc. In both Dutch and English "tousjours" remains untranslated. This omission Spenser rectified in 1591 as follows: "That thinking yet on her I burn and quake".

**E p i g r a m 5.** "E'n punto disparse"; "Et des humains sur l'heure disparu"; "en verdween met mishagen"; "and so forthwith in great despite he dide". The Dutch "met mishagen" (neither in the Italian nor in the French) is exactly rendered by "in (great) despite". The Eng. version gives a most singular turn by "dide", and omits like the Dutch the unnecessary "des humains" of the French.

Line 2. In the same epigram "Ambe due l'ale"; Fr.: "portant esles" is translated by "with purple wings", and Dutch: "met vleugelen".

**S o n e t 2. a.** "toutes de diamant ornient"; "pilaren van fyne diamanten"; "pillers.... all of fine Diamant" (1569); "wrought with diamond" (1591).

**b.** "grandes lames d'or"; "platen van gout seer scoon"; "fine golden plates" (1569); "great plates of gold". A return to the French in 1591.

**S o n e t 4. a.** "du plus riche metal"; "richest golde" (1569); "richest mettalls" (1591). The English version adopts the Dutch use of *gold* (*gout*), but in 1591 returns to the French "metal".

**b.** The last example may perhaps explain why the Eng. (1569) has the curious rendering "with golden wings", for "portant ailes au doz". The Dutch "met vleugelen verzien" omits the descriptive epithet and the English translator in supplying it may have been unconsciously attracted into using the very word supplied in the line immediately preceding (see above Sonet 4 a). Anyway, Spenser corrects this in 1591, with "wings of silver".

**c.** "de celle propre main"; "by his owne skilfull hande"; "de geleerde hand". The Dutch "geleerde" is exactly rendered here by "skilfull". In 1591, Spenser translates: "by his owne industry".

**d.**

- "Puis qu'un oeuvre si beau i'ay veu devant mes yeux"
- "Na dat ic heb gesien een werck so ryk en schoone"
- "Sith I have seen so fair a thing as this" (1569)
- "Sith that mine eyes have seen so fair a sight" (1591)

<sup>7)</sup> Cotgrave gives: *Songer* = to dream, imagine, speak dreamily, contrive etc.

The English agrees with the Dutch in omitting "devant mes yeux" but introduces "mes yeux" ("Mine eyes") in 1591.

Son et 5. "Quand de paisans une troppe barbare"  
 "Als eenen hoop grove en barbare boeren"  
 "When barbarous villaines in disordered heap" 1569.  
 "Barbarous troupe of clownish fone" 1591.

The English adopts the Dutch "hoop" ("heap") and the order "barbare boeren" (i. e. rustics) and returns to the French in 1591.

Son et 7, line 14. English version combines Dutch and French "Devint morte", "werdt drooghe", "withered up and dide". In 1591 Spenser renders "did quite decay".

Son et 8, line 5. Dutch introduces "sprack sy", which is rendered in Eng. "quod she".

Son et 9. "Dessus un mont une Flamme allumee  
 A triple poincte ondoyoit vers les cieux"  
 "Op eenen berch sach ick een vier onsteken  
 Weinsterende dry vlammech nae de lochte"  
 "Upon a hill I saw a kindled flame  
 Mounting like waves with triple point to heaven"

The English follows the Dutch construction of "sach ick" ("I saw"). So in the final couplet the Dutch and the English give an exactly similar turn to

"Ce qui sentoit si bon premierement" by:  
 "Dat te voren goeden reuck heeft ghegheven"  
 "That which erstwhile so pleasaunt scent did yielde",

and in the last line render "odeur sulphuree" alike by "vuylen stanck", "corrupted smel" for which the 1591 version has the characteristically Spenserian "noyous sulphure".

Son et 10. In the 4<sup>th</sup> line the English translator and v. d. Noot hit on identical words: "dryft", "drives" out of several other possible renderings for "roule"; while Spenser translates "washeth" in 1591. And similarly they render "villains pieds" alike by "onreyne voeten", "feete uncleane" for which Spenser in 1591 has "villeine feete". Both English and Dutch agree in omitting the French adjective and translating "onde" by "water" in "La belle onde" ("d'water"; "the water"), while Spenser translates "streme" in 1591. In the last of the apocalyptic sonnets which have otherwise been done from the French translations of v. d. Noot's original Dutch, the Dutch word "vercierf" is nevertheless introduced in "Garnished as a loved spouse" for the French "comme Espouse".

The nature of the deviations from the French text and the identical variants (which may in some cases be due to coincidence, but on the whole *must be admitted to show influence from the Italian and the Dutch*) is rather that of an easy familiarity with the two latter texts than an attempt to follow them closely; for the desire seems to be rather to follow the French closely. And this result, whatever the aim of the translator may have been, has certainly been attained, especially in the case of the apocalyptic sonnets which, one may surely expect, v. d. Noot would have translated from his Dutch, *if he was the sole translator and versifier*.

The possibility of this may be dismissed at once. Van der Noot who had spent barely eighteen months in England could not have made such English verse (better perhaps than the Dutch verse in his own *Theatre*!), and not even if he had stayed very much longer. The fact, also, that he got Theodore Roest to turn the prose of the "Theatre" into English, while he seems to have had sufficient leisure<sup>8)</sup> to have done it himself, goes to show that he lacked sufficient knowledge of English. Of Roest we know nothing except that he is mentioned as the translator of the *prose*, nor is there any reason to suppose him capable of furnishing the English verse, besides he would naturally, too, have translated the Apocalyptic sonnets at least, from the Dutch. Dean Church says: "It is scarcely credible that the translator of the sonnets could have caught so much, as he has done, of the spirit of Petrarch without being able to read the Italian original" — and wonders at the precocity of Spenser ("if Spenser was the translator") "a schoolboy just leaving Merchant Taylors'." Admiration turns into incredulity in the case of Spenser too, when we find the translator familiar with Dutch as well as Italian, and showing also that exact knowledge of French which the translations reveal. This equipment we know V. d. Noot to have possessed, but may infer to have lacked in respect of English<sup>9)</sup>. For this however he could, as he had already engaged Roest to do the prose, enlist the services of some Englishman of a poetic turn; and the inescapable conclusion, all the evidence considered, is that Spenser was the assistant.<sup>10)</sup>

That this assistant knew neither Dutch nor Italian seems very likely from the fact that, when he enters the field, V. d. Noot sacrifices not only many of the terms in his Dutch version from the original Italian, but also most of his earlier renderings of Du Bellay, and moreover allows the original text of his own sonnets to be replaced by the free French version which is now made the working basis for all the poetry. And this agrees very well with our believing the young Spenser (whom on a priori grounds we may reasonably suspect of ignorance of Italian and Dutch, if he already knew French and, of course, Latin and Greek) to have been the translator. With a mind stored with his own previous renderings, V. d. Noot assisted his young collaborator, who would naturally cling to the French. The result was that curiously mingled rendering and at the same time more slavish adherence to the French than V. d. Noot had perhaps purposed or anticipated. That he, a good translator, a man of proved "poeticall sinews", whose *Maecenas* was William Parr, the Queen's favourite, and who was an aspirant to the favour of the Queen herself, should (as others have suggested) have surrendered his poems completely into the hands of an unpractised schoolboy or anybody else, is hardly credible, nay, as has been shown, untenable. And that Spenser required assistance, even in French, we may not only willingly believe, but also have some proof of. Koeppel has shown that Spenser in his translation, "The Ruines of Rome" and Sonnets 6, 8, 13 and 14 which he added in 1591 to make the "Bellay" series complete, is far from being the accurate translator of 1569.<sup>11)</sup> In fact Koeppel's examination reveals

<sup>8)</sup> "In the mean space for auoyding of idlenesse (the very mother & nourice of all vices) I have among other my travayles bene occupied abouete thys little *Treatyse*". Van der Noot; "Epistle".

<sup>9)</sup> There is a medical publication in English, ascribed to V. d. Noot. Vide Grosart and Vermeylen.

<sup>10)</sup> Huberts: "Biographisch Woordenboek", 1878, definitely says so.

<sup>11)</sup> Cp. Friedland and Vermeylen who considerably modify, but cannot controvert Koeppel's arguments relative to the difference between the 1569 translator and Spenser in method and ability.

mistakes and unwarrantable paraphrases in the acknowledged 1591 translations. He is a careless translator and not as sure of his French as he might be. Koeppel therefore asks: "Kann ein schriftsteller aus derselben sprache einmal genau, in ängstlichen anschluss an das original, und richtig, das andere mal ungenau und falsch übersetzen, ist es denkbar, dass er einmal eine gute kenntnis der betreffenden fremden sprache an den tag legt, während er sich das andere mal in derselben sehr mangelhaft bewandert zeigt?" and concludes that Spenser and the 1569 translator cannot possibly be identical. Indeed on the same ground, mainly, Koeppel goes to the length of refusing to recognise that Spenser ever had any share in producing the Theatre. But, obviously, if we can believe Spenser and V. d. Noot to have collaborated, Koeppel's ultimate conclusion loses all validity. There are also some renderings considered by Koeppel as faulty, but that really admit of quite satisfactory explanation, (vide *Times Lit. Suppl.* December, 4, 1924, *Spenser's "Complaints"*), so that Koeppel's argument that Spenser is a poor translator is rather weakened. Nevertheless his case is by no means destroyed and the position remains essentially the same in this respect.

In spite of minor corrections from the original text (in both series), certain weaker renderings of the 1569 versions are readmitted, while at the same time too great liberties are taken in the course of rhyming the Theatre blank verse of the Bellay series. Also the four newly-introduced sonnets and the "Ruines" undoubtedly show Spenser to have occasionally missed the point of the French before him. In this connection the third "Bellay" sonnet is of some interest. The Dutch "Theatre" text I consulted omits this particular sonnet and there seems to have been some shuffling when we find in the commentary: "Upon the xij sonet or Vision"<sup>12</sup>) but are treated to a homily on the 13<sup>th</sup> sonet (i.e. the 2<sup>nd</sup> apocalyp. sonet). It is strange that the third sonet in question for which there is no regular Dutch version,<sup>13</sup>) should be the most unsatisfactorily rendered of all the 1569 poems, and have suffered the most thorough revision in 1591. Upon comparing the various translations and the French, we find that line 4 is strangely interpreted. Surely the French "Tant qu'un archer pourrait prendre visée" comes finally to mean that the spire was as high as an archer could shoot, otherwise there is no point in mentioning the archer in the simile. "Prendre visée" generally means "to take aim", but for "prendre" Cotgrave gives also "catch", "adhere unto", "cleave", etc., while "visée" may mean the *act of aiming* or the OBJECT AIMED AT, and Spenser in 1591 has so translated it: "So far as archer might his LEVEL see", which is a considerable improvement on the 1569 line: "So hie as mought an archer reache with sight". The French probably denotes to hit the target or perhaps to overtake the distance a bow can carry, for visée may also signify — "portee d'une arme de traill" (Godefroy).

In the first two lines of the sonnet the French is as usual carefully followed. From the translator's usual manner we should have expected in line 8, "a great caesar" for "mighty emperour"; "couched ('couchez')" instead of "lay", "torment" for "griefe" in line 10. The French "encore" is omitted; "pour pedestal" is paraphrased by "To beare the frame"; "corps"

<sup>12</sup>) This seems to mean that the number of sonnets and visions is the same, although the first sonnet hardly contains a vision.

<sup>13</sup>) Vermeylen notes that some texts of the Dutch Theatre do contain this sonnet. The French and English prefatory notes are a *perfectly literal* translation of the Dutch: "De ander tiene naestvolgende ghesichten", etc., even though the additional sonnet is inserted.

is rather free for "cendre"; "sodaine" in line 13 is unnecessary and is removed in 1591, while "descend" omitted in 1569, is introduced in 1591 from "descendre". Similarly "brave" is introduced from the French in 1591, instead of the 1569 "noble". Finally the French order, altered in 1569, is strictly followed in 1591. The later rendering, although it introduces some new deviations, reveals a return to the original and correction of the earlier version to an unusual extent. It seems possible, therefore, that the unequal results may have been due to the absence of a guiding Dutch version, and that the boy poet had introduced the sonnet from the French "Theatre" on his own account, the inclusion of which is not properly allowed for in the latter part of the English commentary, but noted at the beginning.

But we must not forget V. d. Noot's statement that *he* had done the translation of the Petrarch "visions", "out of the Brabants speache... into the English tongue", and the Du Bellay ones "out of Dutch into English". Most critics have been baffled by this, some roundly abusing V. d. Noot as an unconscionable double dealer, others taking it as a mischievous attempt at mystification. The Dutch biographer, Huberts, as we have noted, names Spenser as the translator. Now it is not impossible that V. d. Noot may have wished us to infer more than he states, yet the statement can very well mean that he had merely done the translation and not that he had given us the poetic version. He may have made an accurate prose version which he may have used as a guide in the process of translating with his youthful versifier assistant. It is pleasant to find that Grosart gives a similar charitable construction to V. d. Noot's words. The conjecture of Neil Dodge may be cited here.

"For the prose of the Theatre V. d. Noot had found a capable translator in Roest, but, he being apparently no versifier, it was necessary to find someone else for the poetry. If this assistant knew French well so much the better, if he did not, *he could be helped by his chief, in any case his work would be supervised to secure accuracy*" (the italics are ours). Spenser was employed and as "he had done his work and received his pay" "there was no need to acknowledge his services".

In consideration of the foregoing, it will scarcely appear strange that Koepel can find nothing characteristically Spenserian in the diction of the 1569 versions. Quite justly he says:<sup>14)</sup> "dem wortschatz und den wortformen der gedichte von 1569 lässt sich ein sicheres argument zu gunsten der verfasserschaft Spenser's durchaus nicht abgewinnen". Allowing that Spenser had not then cultivated his characteristic poetic diction or style, I attribute the frequent harshness and clumsiness to the infusion of a foreign and particularly a Dutch element. Prof. L. Friedland has expressed himself most confidently in respect of the style, diction and management of the poems being an argument for Spenserian authorship. "Their tone tells us that they are Spenser's"; there are "familiar turns" and "wellknown phrases", but these are not pointed out.

"But sodaine storme did so turmoyle the aire  
And tombled up the sea, that she alas . . ."

is reminiscent of the true Spenserian music and one seems to recognise many another touch, but the footing is not so "sure", as Prof. Friedland would have us believe, when we attempt to use such things for *proofs*. Jusserand has censured Grosart for citing as Spenserian what is only

<sup>14)</sup> p. 26. Vol. 27.

characteristic of Marot.<sup>15)</sup> This editor speaks of the poetry as "preeminently Spenserian" in "character and cadence", but the example he gives is valueless. (Vide *Times Lit. Supplement*. Loc. cit.) He also considers the translations of the apocalyptic sonnets to be "doubtfully Spenserian", yet no one will doubt that the same hand had turned those "sonets" as had Englished the others.

But although this method of argument seems to hold so many pitfalls, there is nothing more certain to the lover of Spenser than that those poems carry a good deal more than a faint suggestion of the Spenserian manner. Reasons though they seem as "plenty as blackberries" (in Koeppel and Jusserand, e.g.) have failed to convince to the contrary. One need be no Cowley to feel that, in spite of much that is unspenserian, the atmosphere and style of the *Theatre* poems are such, at least, as were later cultivated by Spenser in so extraordinary a manner as to become thoroughly characteristic of himself!

It is necessary at this point to mention why Vermeylen believes V. d. Noot to have had no share in the English "Theatre". He justly argues that V. d. Noot could not possibly have written such verse in English (c.p. *Grosart*), and when he finds a mistranslation in the Dutch "Theatre" corrected in the English version, but repeated in the late German version, he refuses to consider that V. d. Noot ever supervised or assisted in the translating.

This example occurs in epigram 6 of the Petrarch series

"Come fior colto langue  
Lieta si dipartio non che secura."

The French for the last line reads:

Puis asseurée en liesse est saille.

The Dutch: Dies sy verheucht spranck int ruyme en int wye,

and the German foolishly:

... des sie erhupfft und spranck auff seidte.

Upon examination, the Dutch translation seems to have been got by combining the French and the Italian lines as follows. "Puis" "lieta si" "dies sy verheucht"; "est saille" "spranck". The notion of "en liesse" having already been expressed by "verheucht" (joyous) could not be repeated as in the English "to joy"; therefore V. d. Noot, having to fill up his line in some other way, supplied the not unpoetic "int ruyme en int wye" (into the wide expanse). The English: "And well assure she mounted up to joy" gives the sense better by keeping to the French, a procedure which saved it from the pitfalls of V. d. Noot's method in the Dutch versions. The above Dutch cannot be called a serious mistranslation, and that the sense is not quite adequately given is rather due to too literal collation. As the German rendering misunderstands even the Dutch, it is more natural to conclude that the German rather than the English version was produced independently of the author, a conclusion that the other freedoms of the German text (see Vermeylen p. 10) strongly support. Nor need we, in this connection, attach any weight to the fact that V. d. Noot retains the point, which Marot omits and the English version is allowed also to miss, that the storm was "oriental" which swallowed the ship (epigram 2); besides, the commentary shows V. d. Noot to have been innocent of its true significance (i.e. a reference to the Eastern plague from which Laura died). V. d. Noot's designed turn of "Fleuve audacieux" (Eng. "violent streme") by "heeft geplant met

<sup>15)</sup> Cp. also Koeppel: p. 106, Vol. 27.

"groot gewelt" (with great violence) can also be disregarded, except in so far as it probably reveals his anti-Roman feelings (c.p. the commentary). At any rate, the point raised by Vermeylen and those we have added are totally insufficient to disprove our thesis that V. d. Noot and Spenser together fashioned those poems.

Other tests based on rhyme and metre have been applied to the problem of Spenserian authorship by Fletcher, Friedland and Koeppel to whose articles the reader is directed. I will only say that their results are contradictory and not at all convincing. Fletcher's analysis leads him to conclude that Spenser, unlike other poets, started by writing free, vigorous blank verse which became *more* formal as he grew in power!

A question of the utmost importance to our subject is the assembling of the "*Complaints*" volume of 1591, in which appeared the versions recast from the *Theatre*, with the cryptic phrase "FORMERLY TRANSLATED" appended to the Petrarch poems. Now as each of the two sets of poems ("Bellay" and "Petrarch") had been "formerly translated" in the well-known *Theatre*, the fact that only "*The Visions of Petrarch*" was thus labelled in 1591, must mean that the label was intended to draw attention to the difference between the manner of reproduction of the two sets: that the "*Visions of Petrarch*" was reproduced in its original "formerly translated" form (with insignificant alterations); whereas the "Bellay" set suffered considerable revision. If there is any further implication surely the implication must be that Spenser had some share at least in such former translation. If the author had meant "formerly translated" by someone else (as Koeppel believes) surely the name of the translator would then have been given. In fact Spenser was merely doing in the case of the *Complaints*, what V. d. Noot had done 22 years before in the case of the *Theatre*; i.e., publishing a joint piece of work in which the rights were more or less divided, as ostensibly from the pen of the writer under whose name the rest of the publication was issued.

With regard to the printer's preface to the *Complaints*, Koeppel believes that Ponsonby by fair means or by foul, had managed to assemble a volume that was unauthorised by the poet, and included the *Theatre* things because their mood accorded with the main theme of the "*Complaints*". But this view is quite untenable. Fletcher<sup>16)</sup> has given good grounds for his belief that Spenser was in every respect behind his publisher, who is merely playing the role of "E.K." in the *Calendar*: one of "wise ignorance". Professor de Selincourt<sup>17)</sup> considers that "the preface contributed by Ponsonby must have been a piece of intentional mystification" and that Spenser "cannot have been innocent of the publication of the volume, though its contents suggest reasons why he might wish to appear so". Nor, in fact, is there any need to think that Ponsonby has not expressed himself plainly. He was a substantial and well-known publisher and no shadowy E.K. By "good meanes" (again used later) he had gathered some of the "*authors poems*" (not poems by another), that he "heard" (from the author of course, otherwise he would scarcely have been sufficiently well-informed to give the names of nine unpublished poems by the same author) had in various ways passed out of the author's hands and were thus difficult to collect. Some of these had "beene diverslie imbezzled and purloyned from him since his departure over sea" (i.e., in 1580 to Ireland)<sup>18)</sup>. When Ponsonby

<sup>16)</sup> Journal of Eng. & Germ. Phil. 1914.

<sup>17)</sup> Introduction "*Spenser's Poetical Works*", p. xxxi.

<sup>18)</sup> See also Mod. Lang. Rev. Vol. 4. Dr. P. W. Long.

wrote that Preface, Spenser had not returned to Ireland and the ten years of his absence from England, during which he had published nothing, could well have accounted for the dispersal of his smaller poems such as the Legends, Pageants, Dreames (on the verge of publication but withheld) which had been written before his first departure to Ireland. It seems fairly clear that Spenser had to abandon his publishing projects unexpectedly<sup>19)</sup> leaving his poems in MS. in the hands of friends, where, in those days of private circulation and piracy, they became dispersed beyond the hope of recovery in some cases. However, scholars are fairly well agreed that most of the material of these dispersed poems found its way into the varied output of later years, and particularly into this volume of "*Complaints*".<sup>20)</sup> Of these poems ("of the which") "dispersed abroad" and "imbezzled and purloyned" the printer, then, has been successful in collecting (on the author's behalf) these specimens, now published together, because they "seeme" (i. e., are seen) "to containe like matter of argument". Moreover, continues the printer, "I understand" (i. e., have knowledge of, know, have ascertained, etc.) "that he besides wrote sundrie other things" in similar vein ("to which effect") "namelie Ecclesiastes . . . being all dedicated to ladies so as (i. e., so that — "final") it may seeme (i. e., may be seen, be evident) he ment them all to one volume". Notice is then given that another volume of scattered poems is in preparation and that the printer will endeavour to collect those numbers which the poet himself is unable to supply him with. When the collection is complete it will be duly "set forth". The preface can hardly be said to be an attempt at mystification, and certainly gives no reason why we should doubt the authenticity of a volume which Spenser's regular publisher, both before and *after* 1591, has issued. Ponsonby acted doubtless as a literary business representative especially during the poet's long periods of absence from London, and the printer's preface must be taken purely in the nature of an advertisement.

The "*Muiopotmos*" to which our "*Visions*" were attached as a pendant was also, like the "*Visions*", dedicated to a "Faire Ladie", Lady Elizabeth Carey. The words "this smal Poëme" in the *Muiopotmos* dedication have caused doubts as to whether the *Visions* that follow can be brought in under this dedication; but it is most likely that when the dedication was reprinted in 1591,<sup>21)</sup> those words were inadvertently left in the singular number, even when the "*Visions*" had been included under the original title-page. The mention of the "Faire Ladie" in the opening and in the final sonnets shows that the "*Visions*" were deliberately included with some dedicatee in view, and their inclusion with the "*Muiopotmos*" without naming the "ladie" again, points to the identity of their dedicatee with that of the chief poem of the group.<sup>22)</sup> This specific dedication and other revision by the poet in his unmistakeable style, and the reappearance of the final "*Petrarch*" quatrain as a beautiful sonnet in Spenser's usual form to serve as a fitting epilogue to the whole volume are alone sufficient to show

<sup>19)</sup> See Virgil's *Gnat*, Harvey Correspondence, and Prof. Greenlaw "Mod. L. Ass. of Am. Pub.", Vol. 25.

<sup>20)</sup> P. M. Buck, *M. L. Ass. of Am. Pub.* Vol. 23.  
Miss Sandison, *M. L. Ass. of Am. Pub.*, Vol. 25.

<sup>21)</sup> First edition, 1590, but not extant. It is in keeping with Spenser's somewhat extravagant courtship of Lady Carey that he should have had a poem, dedicated to her, printed separately and circulated, privately probably.

<sup>22)</sup> See: — *Mod. L. R.* 1908. P. W. Long. "*Spenser and Lady Carey*", also *M. L. Ass. of Am. Pub.* Vols. 25 and 31.

Spenser's cognisance of the publication, and personal interest in the *Theatre* poems.

The "Petrarch" set is now placed at the end, and the final sonnet used to sum up "in parvo" the spirit of the whole volume.

"When I behold this tickle, trustless state", etc.

"And ye faire ladie . . . . .

"When ye these rythimes doo read (i. e., the poems in the volume) and view the rest" (i. e., the "Visions").

But Spenser's just and deliberate use of poems, in which he could claim part-ownership at least, does not form the main interest which the "*Theatre*" holds. The book is more than a "literary curiosity" as Grosart says. "It is a central fact in the story of our national literature" and the evolution of blank verse. He judges the blank verse of the *Theatre* to be superior to that of Surrey and Gascoigne, and every writer who has considered the question speaks in similar vein. Mr. Fletcher believes that "the lad of 17 (Dan Chaucer leading) is the most finished maker of blank verse before Marlowe", and Cory in his study of Spenser (p. 181) considers it "work most extraordinary for the year 1569". The two sonnets (Nos. 1 and 3) in the Surrey form are of great interest, while blank verse sonnets are unique for that early time, so that altogether the "*Theatre*" gives also a distinctive contribution to the experimental stage of sonnet literature, during its most meagre period. The verdict of the D. N. B. that the *Theatre* poems are a "promising performance for an undergraduate" is distinctly faint praise for some of the poetry, e. g., the sweetly tuneful lines of the first "Bellay" sonnet, the second line of which Cory considers "a remarkably cadenced line for a schoolboy to write only 8 years after 'Gorboduc' and fifteen years before Peele."

(To be concluded.)

W. J. B. PIENAAR.

## How To Study Old English Syntax.

The editors of this paper have been repeatedly requested to supply information on the question how one is to gain a knowledge of the history of English syntax in general, and of Old English syntax in particular. And a publisher in a university town even wrote to me recently suggesting that there is a real demand for a book on this subject. We feel certain, therefore, that in offering some observations on the problem mentioned in the heading of this article we are supplying a real need; and as it is the object of this periodical to spread the scientific knowledge of English as much as to increase it, thus supplementing the work done or left undone by the universities, the appearance of this article in our periodical, though perhaps of an unusual type, does not require defence.

To a student acquainted with the study of living languages, of Europe at least, it will seem strange that there should be no book of any type, whether advanced or elementary, on Old English syntax. This is in strong contrast with the great number of books offering help to those who wish to begin the study of the language by studying its accidence and its sounds. Of these last there are probably quite enough, if not more than enough. Besides the standard works of Sievers and Bülbring we have the valuable little books by Sweet (the *Anglo-Saxon Primer*,<sup>1</sup>) and the *First Steps in*

<sup>1</sup>) The only book of the kind that takes any notice of syntax.

*Anglo-Saxon*). It is not necessary to enumerate the numerous readers, although it does not seem to be generally understood that Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader* surpasses all others. But on Old English syntax there is only one book, and even that is incomplete: Wülfing's *Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen* (Bonn, 1894-1901, in three parts). It is not necessary to criticize this work, which shows wonderful industry, but can be used only as a work of reference. And yet it is the only book on Old English syntax that has appeared, unless one wishes to include among 'books' the numerous dissertations that have appeared, chiefly in Germany. It is safe to say (one need not even read them to be able to say it) that they are 'unequal.' A good many of them are necessarily useless, for few students are sufficiently advanced in the study of Old English at the end of their university career to deal satisfactorily with these problems. And the dissertations are at any rate not the best introduction to the subject for beginners, dealing at best only with a limited part of the subject.

The cause of the absence of a handbook on Old English syntax is apparent, however, to any one acquainted with the course of Indogermanic studies in general, and of Germanic studies in particular: for nearly half a century the energy of students of Indogermanic languages has been chiefly absorbed by a study of the sound-systems and the systems of accidence and word-formation. It is only since the appearance of Delbrück's work on Indogermanic syntax, in the first edition of Brugmann's *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, that syntactical study has become more important. For the syntactical study of the older languages of our group, such as ancient Greek and Latin and Sanskrit, a great deal has been done, not only by linguists but also by pure philologists (in the continental and American sense of this word). But the syntactic study of Oldgermanic languages has only begun,<sup>1)</sup> important contributions having been published by Delbrück. In many cases, however, these studies deal with the Old Germanic languages as a group, not with Old English in particular. From a scientific point of view this is the natural attitude, for Old English syntax cannot be completely understood except as one of the group of dialects to which it belongs; and it must be looked upon rather as the latest representative of the original Indogermanic system than as the beginning of the new, English, system. The scientific study of Old English syntax would be much easier, however, if there existed a full descriptive grammar such as has been written for Old Icelandic (Nygaard, *Norrøn Syntax*).

For the present, however, those who wish to gain a knowledge of Old English syntax as the foundation for their historical English studies must manage without a handbook. And their case is by no means hopeless, even if they have no oral teaching to help them. For syntax, as these students require it, can very well be studied from the texts themselves. Indeed, this may be the best way of gaining knowledge that does not evaporate a few months after the examination has been passed. Of course, this method of studying has its disadvantages: the results are sure to be scrappy, the student will unavoidably have serious gaps in his knowledge. A handbook would enable him to 'round off' his knowledge and to supplement deficiencies. On the other hand, the student is not tempted to use his handbook instead of studying the texts, as is frequently the case among students of Modern English syntax.

<sup>1)</sup> We might say: resumed. For Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* made a wonderful start, in its fourth volume.

The difficulty to be solved is, therefore, to learn how to study one's texts. The first requirement is a sound knowledge of OE. accidence as well as sounds. Experience teaches that even Dutch students, who are in a very favourable position for learning Old English, because they know both modern English and a flectional language like modern German, which strongly resembles Old English in its structure and even in its vocabulary, often neglect a proper study of accidence. Besides this, the student must have some knowledge of general syntax, just as a student of the sounds of a language must have a knowledge of general phonetics. And just as a student of general phonetics begins by examining the sounds best known to him, i.e. his own pronunciation, a student of syntax should begin by studying the syntax of his own language. In both cases, the case of phonetics and of syntax, the student may, indeed must, profit by the experience of his predecessors which is embodied in the handbook. The Dutch student must, therefore, begin by studying Dutch syntax. He must study it, however, which is a very different thing from *learning* it: he must test the statements of the handbook by his own observations, both of his own speech and that of others. If he does this conscientiously he is sure to contradict his handbook, for the syntax of spoken Dutch is a comparatively 'new' subject. And just as in the case of phonetics, it will be useful to compare other languages that the student really knows. The first of these languages is, of course, modern English. And here the student has the advantage of a language that has been studied with great minuteness. He will be wise in completing his practical study of English syntax, which was necessary to enable him to gain correctness in the speaking and writing of living English, by a more theoretical study. It is not necessary to mention books on this subject: it was treated in a chapter of the *Guide to English Studies* that was published in the April number of last year. If the student knows more languages so much the better; any syntax may help to elucidate another language, as experience has again and again proved. But of most direct use will be the study of Gotic syntax, for which the best book is Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch*. If the student wishes to trace things further back he will be glad to use Sommer, *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen*, first published in 1921 (Teubner; 126 pp.). Of course, if the student knows Latin and Greek, he will turn to those languages; Greek is most important in matters of syntax, the best book being Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* revised by Thumb (Fourth edition in 1913). But the beginner should not go too wide afield and would probably be wise in restricting himself for a long time to a thorough study of modern Dutch and modern English, from which he may turn to Gotic. The Old English texts should remain in the centre, a reasonable degree of familiarity with the language being indispensable for any profitable study of its syntax. I believe that the books by Sweet (*Steps*, *Primer*, and *Reader*) are sufficient for this purpose.

I will now illustrate all this by some concrete examples. Suppose the student is reading the famous introduction to the *Cura Pastoralis*. It is in Sweet's *Reader*, on pp. 4ff., but it is convenient to copy the text as a very few sentences are sufficient:

Ælfred kyning hateð gretan Wærferð biscep his wordum luflice  
ond freondlice; ond ðe cyðan hate ðæt me com swiðe oft on gemynd,  
hwele wiotan iu wærон giond Angelcynn, ægðer ge godcundra hada  
ge woruldcundra; ond hu gesæliglica tida ða wærон giond Angelcynn;

ond hu *ða* kyninges *ðe* *ðone* onwald hæfdon *ðæs* folces on *ðam* dagum Gode ond his ærendwrecum hersumedon; ond hu hie ægðer ge hiora sibbe ge hiora siðo ge hiora onweald innanbordes gehioldon, ond eac ut hiora eðel gerymdon; ond hu him *ða* speow ægðer ge mid wige ge mid wisdome; ond eac *ða* godcundan hadas hu giorne hie waeron ægðer ge ymb lare ge ymb liornunga, ge ymb ealle *ða* diowotdomas *ðe* hie Gode don scoldon; ond hu man utanbordes wisdom ond lare hieder on lond sohte, ond hu we hie nu sceoldon ute begietan, gif we hie habban sceoldon.

The first task is to translate this into idiomatic English; it is important to see that the modern English is idiomatic: otherwise the translation would help to hide the differences between Old and Modern English which it is the very purpose of the translation to reveal. Thus, in the second sentence, *com* should be translated by *has come* rather than *came*. When the translation has been accomplished, we return to the beginning, to look at the details. We observe that *hatan*, like Dutch *bevelen*, but unlike English *command*, can take a simple infinitive; also that the object follows the whole verbal group, unlike modern Dutch. In *his wordum* we come to a phenomenon that cannot be illustrated by reference to modern Dutch or English, which have both lost the old case-system. Here a knowledge of German will be useful, although this, too, has lost the instrumental case, so that the comparison of Gothic will be more helpful. The student should, if necessary, turn to his Old English grammar in order to find out in what cases there were special forms for the instrumental, in what cases the function was served by what we call the dative. In the second sentence *hatan* may seem to be construed with an accusative and infinitive, but on closer inspection it will probably be seen that *ðe* depends upon *cyðan* only. The dative *me* is in contrast to the modern construction where an attributive *my* (*it has often come into my mind*) is required; we learn that the present difference in this respect between Dutch and English is due to an English innovation. Attributive *hwelce*, although etymologically identical with *which*, is used for modern *what*; we have again an instance of English innovation. A reference to the Oxford Dictionary will show that the last example of *which* in this function has been found in the thirteenth century, a period of enormous changes both in vocabulary and in syntax. — The genitives *godcundra* and *woroldcundra* suggest a comparison of the uses of the genitive in the two periods of English. Old English has no post-genitive, but can use the genitive of practically any noun; it is also free in putting it before or after the headword, or at a distance from it. The functions of the genitive in Old English are also far more numerous than in present English. — The sentence *hu ða* *cyningas* etc. shows that as early as the ninth century we find dependent statements as well as questions introduced by the originally interrogative *how*. — We can also study the use of the definite article in our text. The use in *on ðam dagum* shows that it was really still a demonstrative pronoun, sometimes with a clearly deictic function, but in other cases, as in *ða kyninges*, the deictic function is much weaker. — The sentence *hu ða* *cyningas* etc. also shows a wordorder that is peculiar to the subordinate clause, well known to a Dutch speaker who has studied the wordorder of his own language. — We also find an impersonal verb here: *speow*. The construction is very common in the older language, whereas modern English has almost lost it. On this subject there is an excellent book by a Dutch scholar: van der Gaaf, *The Transition from*

*the Impersonal to the Personal Construction in Middle English* (Angl. Forsch. no. 14). — OE. uses *mid* for modern *with*; there is an admirable study on these prepositions in the same series by Erla Hittle. Our passage also illustrates one of the relative constructions in OE. with the particle *ðe*. If the student wants to know more about it he is not dependent on his own observations only: he can refer to a source of syntactical knowledge that is probably too often underestimated, or even completely ignored, the dictionary. There are plenty of examples, both with the accompanying personal pronoun and without, in Bosworth-Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. The article on *ðe* contains a reference to the demonstrative-relative *se*. The student will not easily meet with a case of a non-connected adjective clause that is so common in present English (*the book he gave me*), for it hardly existed in old English. — Comparison of the older and the present language will also bring home to the student the fact that the share of the non-finite verb in the construction of the sentence was much smaller formerly than it is now. But he will notice such differences the better *the more familiar he is with the details of modern English syntax*: that is a fundamental truth which it may not be superfluous to repeat.

It must also be borne in mind that the term Old English is a collective name for a considerable period. And just as a student of English is well aware that the language of Dryden, and even of the writers in the *Spectator*, is distinctly different from that of the present day, he will have no difficulty in believing that there are differences between the language of the eighth century and of the tenth or eleventh. Here again, no wise examiner will expect a candidate to have detailed knowledge; but it is perfectly possible for a beginner to have an idea of the differences. The fact cannot be taught in a more effective way than by the study of a text that has been re-written at a later date. And we are fortunate enough to possess such a text: the Dialogues of Pope Gregory in the translation originally made by Bishop Wærferth, at the request of King Alfred, and the tenth-century revision by a West-saxon who was a better Latin scholar than the bishop. Here again I will give a practical illustration.

The book has been published by Hans Hecht in Grein's *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*. Where we possess both the copy of the original (Mercian) text (MS C) and the West-Saxon revision (MS H) the two are printed in parallel columns. It is not necessary for me to illustrate the numerous cases that the C-text has an instrumental, which the revisor (who has been proved to have used the translation of the bishop as well as the original Latin) replaced by a dative with a preposition, they are found in plenty. The attentive student will also find that the C-text has very often final verb-position in subordinate clauses, which is altered (modernized) in the H-text. A frequent difference between the two texts<sup>1)</sup> is the use of a subordinate clause in the earlier whereas the revisor used an infinitive with *to*; this is illustrated by a case on p. 27, 1.3: 'ne blan he hwæðre þæt he his geongran ne manode þæt hi næfre gelyfdon heom sylfum to swiðe in þissere wisan' (he never ceased from admonishing his disciples, however, not to have too much confidence in themselves with regard to this matter). The H-text puts it thus: 'Swa þeah ne geswac he to manienne his gingran þæt hy of his bysene on þysum þingum him sylfum eaðelice ne getruwodon', etc. And the difference of construction is not due to the substitution of another finite verb (*geswac* for the older (obsolete?) *blan*),

<sup>1)</sup> I have nothing to do here with the difference of dialect.

as is shown by many cases where there is no such substitution, and yet the same difference of construction. Thus on p. 40, 1.25 the C-text reads: 'Dauid þe gewunade þat he hæfde witedomes gast in him', whereas the Hatton-man changes this into: 'Dauid þe gewunade to hæbbene witedomes gast on him'. — Another point, not indeed one that shows a chronological difference, is the hesitation of the scribes with regard to the form of the participle in what may be called the accusative with present participle construction. On p. 24, 1 30 the C-text has: 'ða com se wyrtweard on gewunelicre tide and he þone þeof þær *hangiende* funde' (Then the gardener came at the usual time, and found the thief hanging there); the Hatton-text writes *hangiendne*, i.e. the inflected form. The same uncertainty is illustrated by two cases on p. 37; in 1. 2 the C-text reads: 'þa he þa geseah þone cniht to him *cyrrende* and hig *berende* on his swearan', whereas the other text has *yrnende* and *berendne*.

A pupil who has studied in the way suggested here may not, indeed, have an exact knowledge of the peculiarities of Old English syntax that is at all comparable with his knowledge of Modern English syntax; but it may be asked what advanced scholar has such knowledge. The number of those who would be able to imitate the example of Sweet who paraphrased part of the Beowulf successfully, must be very small: at any rate, nothing of the kind has ever been done. But the method recommended here seems to be able to do two things: to give the student an idea of the way in which we may make progress in our knowledge of Old English, and secondly to give him an idea of the differences between the old and the new. How great these differences are will be very clear when the sentence from Alfred's preface, surely no unfair specimen, is compared with the following example of plain modern English:

'It was entertaining, for the first time, to hear him tell how once, in the old days, while walking like God<sup>1)</sup> in his garden at Salonika, inhaling the perfumed breeze of the Balkan dusk, there had suddenly fallen at his feet, flung over the garden wall, a matchbox which when opened was discovered to contain a human ear'. Mackenzie, Rich Relatives, chapter 5.

Those who think they know Old English syntax thoroughly may try to translate this sentence into the language of Alfred.

E. KRUISINGA.

## Notes and News.

**B-examen 1925.** — Het Bijvoegsel tot de St. Ct. van 9 Maart, no. 47, bevat het „Verslag der commissie, in 1925 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelsche taal en letterkunde”. Wij nemen er het volgende uit over:

De uitslag van het examen, ongeveer even ongunstig als het vorige jaar, geeft de commissie aanleiding tot het maken van de volgende opmerkingen:

Wat betreft het taalkundig gedeelte, zou de commissie gevoeglijk de woorden van haar voorgangster kunnen herhalen: de resultaten van het examen waren onbevredigend. Op zijn minst even onbevredigend was de uitslag van het letterkundig gedeelte. Dit geldt in de eerste

<sup>1)</sup> He was the English Consul there.

plaats zoowel van den inhoud als van den opzet der opstellen. Over het algemeen waren zij slecht gebouwd en meermalen weken de candidaten naar eigen goedvinden af van de onderwerpen, zooals de commissie ze had geformuleerd. „Dit heeft”, schreef de commissie in 1924, „onverbiddelijk tot gevolg gehad, dat een onvoldoend cijfer werd toegekend voor den inhoud.”

Erger nog dan in vorige jaren bleken vele candidaten bij het bestuderen van de geschiedenis der letterkunde de oud-Engelsche en vaak zelfs de middel-Engelsche periode te hebben verwaarloosd. Het gaat niet aan, dat iemand zich beperkt tot het bestuderen van den Lofzang van Caedmon (negen regels) en Beda's Sterflied (vijf regels) en bij de middel-Engelsche literatuur vóór Chaucer tot enkele fragmenten. Dit is een parodie op de studie van Engelsche letterkunde. „Candidaten verminderen hun kans van slagen door grote stukken der literatuur te verwaarlozen”, aldus het vorige verslag. Ook trof het de commissie, dat er candidaten waren, wier kennis van den roman van het midden der 19de eeuw zóó gering was, dat zij van de grote schrijvers uit dien tijd slechts één werk in hun leeslijst konden opgeven, terwijl bij het mondeling onderzoek soms bleek, dat wat gelezen was, nog slecht was gelezen.

De studie van de letterkundige critiek, het belangrijkste bij-verschijnsel van de letterkunde zelf, bleek, ten onrechte, zeer verwaarloosd te zijn. De candidaten moeten door de lezing van althans enkele bekende voortbrengselen op dit gebied zich eenigszins een begrip hebben gevormd van de ontwikkeling der critiek sinds de 16de eeuw.

Van het onderdeel: stijlleer bleek de kennis van een groot aantal candidaten te bestaan uit het kunnen herhalen van een aantal uit het hoofd geleerde regels, die zij bij hun studie verzuimd hadden aan het gelezen te toetsen en dus ook op het examen niet konden toepassen.

Gedurende het mondeling examen bleken enkele candidaten niet in staat hun gedachten met gemak uit te drukken in de vreemde taal; de vaardigheid liet vaak te wenschen over.

---

### Bijlage III. Write an Essay on one of the following subjects:

1. What conclusion can you draw concerning Chaucer's character from his original poetry?
2. The relation between the stories and the tellers of the stories of the Canterbury Tales.
3. The Ballad considered as a form of literature.
4. Discuss Miss Louisa Pound's theory of the origin of the Ballad.
5. Discuss the various purposes which the Sonnet has served.
6. Milton's sonnets as revelations of his character and poetic genius.
7. Discuss Shakespeare's mind and art in two of the plays you have read.
8. Discuss the dramatic importance of the minor personages in one or more of Shakespeare's great tragedies.
9. Discuss Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained in their relation to the Biblical story.
10. Milton's sonnets as revelations of his character and poetic genius.
11. French influences in Goldsmith's work.
12. Goldsmith as an observer of human nature.
13. Purpose in the novels of Fielding and Smollett.
14. Discuss the relative merits of Joseph Andrews, Tom Jones and Amelia.
15. Humanitarianism as an element in the romantic poetry of the 18th century.
16. The debt of romanticism to Thomas and Joseph Warton.
17. Traces of the influence of the Gothic novel in the prose fiction of the early 19th century.
18. Natural scenery and natural phenomena in the Gothic novel.

19. The satirical element in Burns's poetry.
20. Scotch songs and Burns's poetry.
21. Discuss what is meant by Byronism.
22. Discuss the difference between the first and the second half of Childe Harold.
23. Keats in the opinion of his contemporaries.
24. Sleep and Poetry, considered as Keats's poetic creed.
25. The greatness of Jane Austen's genius and its limitations.
26. Contemporary life in Jane Austen.
27. Local colour in the Brontë novels.
28. The element of Nature in Wuthering Height and Jane Eyre.
29. The provincial life in George Eliot's works.
30. Silas Marner, an early work of great promise.
31. The self-revealing nature of Browning's poetry.
32. The influence of Italy on Browning's poetry.
33. A. C. Bradley's statement, that Tennyson will be considered "the best poet of his own age, though not so much the best as his own age supposed."
34. Tennyson's treatment of classical sources and models.
35. Morris and the Pre-Raphaelites.
36. Discuss the plan, form and spirit of the Earthly Paradise.
37. The effect of environment on character in the Wessex novels.
38. Female characters in the Return of the Native.
39. Foreign influences in the modern drama.
40. Shaw's Pygmalion as a study of class-morality and class-manners.

**English Association in Holland.** Steuart Wilson gave lecture-recitals of *English Songs* at Flushing (March 12), Amsterdam (13), Nijmegen (15), Enschede (16), Deventer (17), Utrecht (18), Groningen (19) and Amersfoort (20). Also to schools at Almelo (R.H.B.S., 17) and Hilversum (Chr. Lyceum and G.H.B.S., 18).

Mr. Frank J. Adkins, M.A., lectured to the Dordrecht, Hilversum and Groningen branches on March 23, 24 and 27 resp., on *The Mediaeval Drama*, and to the Haarlem and Enschede branches on *The Growth of Towns* (March 25 and 26).

## Points of Modern English Syntax.

211. Clearly, it was not for such as he to demean himself by bellowing and cuffing. Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* p. 185.

Why is it *he*, not *him*? Hdbk. 99.

212. I have never, when I could have done so, taken the trouble to read original reviews of this little book; and am not now in a position to do it. Saintsbury, in *Essays by Members of the English Ass.* VI p. 52.

What is peculiar in the use of *so* here? Hdbk. 1042.

Observe also the use of *it*, and compare it with the case of *so*.

213. The messengers were already hurrying off to Kensington Palace to bear to his successor *her* summons to the throne. Justin McCarthy, *Hist. of our Own Time*, ch. I.

What is the relation in meaning between the possessive and its noun? Hdbk. 1077.

214. What the better are they for that as souls or as citizens or any other way? A. Conan Doyle, *Strand Magazine*, Aug. 1925 p. 113/2.

Discuss the function of *what* in this sentence. Hdbk. does not illustrate this function, but see the Addendum on p. 311 of Vol. II.

215. Which one of us is able to recall with complete sharpness all the varied details of a night's dreams? Lowie, *Primitive Religion*, p. 109.

It would be possible, indeed more usual, to use *who* here. What difference does the use of *which* make? Hdbk. 1118.

216. Sometimes, turn my head which way I would, I seemed to see the gold.  
George Eliot, *Silas Marner*, ch. 19.

What class of pronoun is *which* here, and in what sort of sentence is it used? Hdbk. 1146.

217. Yet sometimes — as one can imagine happening with him in actual conversation — his utterances took the form of a half-soliloquy. Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* p. 292,

What is the function of *as*, and what construction is used with *to imagine*? Hdbk. 1173, and 532.

218. All cleverness, whether in the rapid use of that difficult instrument the tongue, or in some other art unfamiliar to villagers, was in itself suspicious. George Eliot, *Silas Marner* ch. I.

What is the function of the demonstrative here? Hdbk. 1185.

219. Yet even in this stage of withering a little incident happened, which showed that the sap of affection was not all gone. Ib. ch. 2.  
So he couldn't have been all bad. *Strand Magazine*, July 1925, p. 93/1.

What is the function of *all* in these two sentences? Hdbk. 1319.

220. For in a Trappist monastery each monk has an occupation of his own choice, apart from his religious duties and the general labours of the house. Stevenson, *Travels with a Donkey*.

What difference would it make if *every* were used instead of *each*? Hdbk. 1328.

221. By long watching the spot as she worshipped it became as if she saw the three returned ones there kneeling. Hardy, *Life's Little Ironies*.

What is the function of *ones*; does it refer to any noun? Hdbk. 1391, 2.

222. "Good Gum", Edwy exclaimed with contempt. "We can't race anything with this load, can we?" Compton Mackenzie, *Rich Relatives* ch. 7.

What part of the sentence is *anything*? Hdbk. 1436.

223. Above and below, you may hear it wimpling over the stones, an amiable strippling of a river, which it seems absurd to call the Loire. Stevenson, *Travels*.  
Before her and behind her the river of the wall<sup>1)</sup> flowed through a champaign of roofs from which towers and spires rose like trees. Mackenzie, *Rich Relatives* ch. 1.

Does *of* in these sentences qualify the preceding or the following noun? Hdbk. 1463.

224. Mother often says things one wouldn't expect her to. Mrs. Cotes, *Cinderella* ch. 14.  
"Suppose we burn this too," I said. "It's absurd not to!" but she seized my hand. Ib. ib.

What is the function of the final *to*, and are the two examples exactly identical? Hdbk. 1471, 2 and 3.

225. There are passages in the Khartoum Journals which call up in a flash the light, gliding figure, and the blue eyes with the candour of childhood still shining in them. Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians*, p. 292.

He drew caricatures, in the margin, of Sir Evelyn Baring, with sentences of shocked pomposity coming out of his mouth. Ib. ib.

Has *with* a distinct meaning here, or is it rather used as a grammatical form-word? Hdbk. 1476.

226. Every time the rays of a passing lamp splashed the brougham Jasmine felt that she ought to say something. Mackenzie, *Rich Relatives* ch. 5.

Does *every time* form part of the first subordinate clause, or of the headclause? Hdbk. 1479.

227. The questionable sound of Silas's loom. Eliot, *Silas Marner*, ch. 1.

Is *questionable* formed from the noun or from the verb? Hdbk. 1624.

<sup>1)</sup> i.e. the wall winding like a river.

228. Wood is excellent company — very alive, brilliantly intelligent, and most amusing.... I have stated that he makes an excellent companion; I should have added that he is a splendid friend. Strand Magazine July 1925, p. 65.

Account for the absence of the article before *excellent company*; is *he makes a splendid companion* a nominal or a verbal sentence? Hdbk. 1760 and 1830, 1866.

229. The whole matter continued to be wrapped in a painful obscurity: there were, he believed, Unitarians and Unitarians; and he could say no more. Eminent Victorians p. 193.

What is the function of the repetition here? Hdbk. 1823.

230. The immediate bystanders could hear that he called her mother. Hardy, Life's Little Ironies.

The twelve-foot drop into the garden below was nothing: the young man accomplished it with an enthusiastic absence of hesitation. Mackenzie, Rich Relatives ch. 1.

What is the relation of the adjectives *immediate* and *enthusiastic* to their headwords? Hdbk. 1847 f.

231. It was with a gay and uplifted heart that James strolled the garden and smoked his pipe next morning. Strand Magazine Febr. 1925.

What part of the sentence is *the garden*? Hdbk. 1856, 1.

232. It was blowing stiffly from the south upon the other slope of the Lozère, and every step I took I was drawing nearer to the wind. Stevenson, Travels.

What is the function of *every step*; in what respect does it differ from the case in the preceding sentence? Hdbk. 1856, 2.

233. The Senator leaned across and patted Mr. Billingham on the back. Strand Magazine August 1925 p. 150/1.

What part of the sentence is *Mr. B.*? Hdbk. 1878 (also 1088).

234. If, as in the good old days, I could boldly believe a Frenchman to be an inferior creature, while he, as simply, wrote me down a savage, there would be an easy end of the matter. Lytton Strachey, Books and Characters p. 3.

What is the function of *a savage* in this sentence? Hdbk. 1886.

235. That this feeling towards Maxwell on the part of so many men of science comes wholly from his work, in complete ignorance of his life, we should be reluctant to assert; that it comes partly from his work we are convinced. Times Lit. Suppl. 17/9, 1925 p. 589/4.

What is the function of the last *that*-clause? Hdbk. 1914.

236. To what extent Dr. Manning's prayer was answered must remain a matter of doubt. Eminent Victorians p. 122.

Does the sentence open with a subject- or an object-clause? Hdbk. 1916.

237. There was therefore nothing left but her trunk, which Aunt Cuckoo decided was neither too large nor too heavy for the brougham. Mackenzie, Rich Relatives, ch. 5.

To which clause does *which* belong? Hdbk. 1938, 1137, 2178 ff.

It was Miss Armytage of the hall begun to whole thing. Strand Magazine August 1925.

...; and it is not always the most faithful believer who makes the cunningest apostle. Stevenson, Travels.

... and the best that we can find in our travels is an honest friend. He is a fortunate voyager who finds many. Ib.

He must be a stiff, ungodly Protestant who can take anything but pleasure in this kind and hopeful story. Ib.

Compare the use of *it* and *he* in these sentences. Hdbk. 1984.

239. He was sparing in his allusions to the hand of Providence, while those mysterious doubts and piercing introspections, which must have filled him, he almost entirely concealed. Eminent Victorians p. 282.

Account for the wordorder in this sentence. Hdbk. 2168.

240. There's no sort of permanence about the immediate object, if you understand me, of our loyal affections. *Mrs. Cotes, Cinderella* p. 229f.

There was no sort of parallel to all this in history — except it be David with Uriah the Hittite. *Eminent Victorians* p. 293.

What is the function of *sort of* here? *Hdbk.* 2236.

## Reviews.

*Shakespeare: A Survey.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. London, Sidgwick & Jackson. Ltd. 1925. 325 pp. 7/6.

These thirty-four essays were first published some twenty years ago as introductions to the plays of Shakespeare, and are now reprinted without any material alterations. Twenty years of intense critical occupation with Shakespeare have had so little effect on our aesthetic appreciation of the plays, that a collection of literary essays of great value, written before that period, can be published unaltered, as if they had been written yesterday. During this period two schools of criticism greatly increased our knowledge of Shakespeare's work. The historical school tried to interpret the works by the light of the contemporary drama, and derived much of its knowledge from the study of Elizabethan stage-technique. The bibliographical school, founded by Pollard, studied the texts microscopically and owed much of its information to the Elizabethan printing-house. Aesthetical criticism did not seem to agree with the exact temper of twentieth century scholarship, though it never quite died out. Bradley's great book on *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904) was constantly being reprinted, Raleigh's "Men of Letters" *Shakespeare* appeared in 1907, Benedetto Croce published his aesthetic studies during the period under discussion, and Mr. Stopford Brooke wrote his very readable essays on the plays of Shakespeare; but most scholars thought with Sidney Lee that enough had been written on the aesthetic side. It is therefore with the greater pleasure that we welcome this new-old book of Sir Edmund Chambers.

One of the greatest merits of this book is its clear definitions of the types of dramatic expression. Comedy resolves itself into three distinct kinds — drama of amusement — drama of ideas — drama of emotion. The drama of amusement claims no rank as art. The drama of ideas is comedy as Molière wrote it. It is the medium through which the dramatic artist conveys to the audience his ideas about life. Comedy of ideas is often one of the most serious and even didactic of utterances, reform being its aim. *Twelfth Night* and *As You Like It* are comedies of ideas.

In the comedy of emotion the dramatic artist conveys to the audience his emotions about life through the medium of their sympathies with the woes and exultations of the characters whom he fashions for the purpose. For such emotional or romantic comedy, as distinct from comedy proper, "tragedy" is perhaps the happiest term. *The Merchant of Venice* is such a tragicomedy, a drama of emotional stress, with a happy ending.

Farce is in the first place a variety of the comedy of ideas. It is comedy translated from the speech and manners of a cultivated society into the speech and manners of the "bourgeoisie" (*The Taming of the Shrew*; *The Merry Wives*). There is another kind of farce which is sharply differentiated from comedy by the fact that in it the interest of character is wholly replaced by an interest of plot. The basis of such a farce is some impossible assumption, which, however, you must take for granted; it is beyond your

criticism. From these absurd premises a logical conclusion is deducted without any further breach of the probabilities. The plot of the *Comedy of Errors* is such a farcical plot.

Chambers recognizes three kinds of tragedy: external tragedy, or tragedy of villainy — psychological tragedy, or tragedy of character — cosmic tragedy, or tragedy of fate. In *Titus Andronicus* we have an example of the first category. It is interesting to observe that traces of the blood and revenge tragedy are found throughout the work of Shakespeare. Such plays as *Richard II*, *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet* are psychological tragedy. The failure and ruin of the hero are the natural result of his inefficiency. In *King Lear* and *Macbeth* on the other hand, the hero struggles in vain against the relentless force of a malevolent fate. Tragedy here takes the form of an arraignment of heaven. It is the pessimist's indignant protest against the remorseless gods. Cosmic tragedy is therefore pagan in sentiment. The ultimate triumph of evil finds no place in the Christian scheme of things.

The various definitions of comedy, farce and tragedy, here given, are not the only merit of this remarkable book. There are excellent observations on *Richard III* as an historical tragedy evolved out of the shapeless chronicle history. Though the essay form does not allow of the exposition of a complete critical theory, the book is a store-house of critical wisdom and valuable to all those who read Shakespeare for enjoyment. You have but to open at random to find suggestions which make you see the plays in a clearer light. I mention but a few of them. *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, and *Henry V* form a dramatic study of kingship, from the flower-like inefficient Richard, through the matter-of-fact, coldly practical Bolingbroke, leading up to Shakespeare's ideal king. — The three youthful plays *Richard II*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* have this in common, that the first is lyrical history, the second lyrical tragedy, the third lyrical comedy. The three together form an experiment towards making drama. — *Julius Caesar* was probably written shortly after *Henry V*. Both plays treat the same subject matter, the one as a heroic history, the other as a tragedy. Between the two lies Shakespeare's changed attitude towards life. The history holds up the efficient man as the fair ideal, the tragedy asks our sympathy for the inefficient idealist who is defeated by the practical man. — About *Henry IV* Chambers observes that in it "chronicle history becomes a tapestried hanging, dimly wrought with horsemen and footmen, which serves as a background to groups of living personages belonging to a very different order of reality." By this observation the heterogeneous characters of the Falstaff plays at once crystallize into clearly distinct groups, and we see the immortal fat knight and his merry companions playing their pranks against the stiff background of a warlike aristocracy.

It is of course possible to differ from the author's conclusions here and there. Thus I think that the resignation which most readers of Shakespeare feel at the end of even the darkest tragedies pleads against Chambers's assertion that evil is triumphant at the end of *Lear* or *Macbeth*, for normal humanity cannot remain satisfied with the triumph of evil. On the contrary there is in Shakespeare's tragedies evidence enough of an order of things which by its nature is opposed to evil, and there is no tragedy in which the evil-doer is not defeated at the end, be it at the cost of much innocent blood.

The appreciation of the characters of *Macbeth* and his Lady might almost be called a test of temperament. The author is predisposed in favour of the lady. I think he altogether leaves out of account the immense imagination of *Macbeth* which makes his sin so great and so monstrous. He unwittingly

ruined his own soul in killing the king, whereas we might say, that on the day of the murder of Duncan Lady Macbeth was already a sleep-walker. She knew not what she did. But Macbeth saw the hugeness of his crime before he did it, because, like all Shakespeare's heroes, he was "great of heart".

The study of *Hamlet* tastes too much of Coleridge and *Wilhelm Meister*, to be acceptable to modern readers. I do not like to read, in a book of 1925, about "this modern born out of due time, the high-strung dreamer, the academic man brought suddenly into the world of strenuous action and proving himself but the clay pot there". Bradley has shown sufficiently clearly that such a view does not stand the test of a careful and unprejudiced reading of the text. I find I have a good many interrogation-marks in the margin of this essay on *Hamlet*. Hamlet's "outlook is unusual among the ruder Danes." Are Claudius and Laertes and Osric, and the rest, "rude Danes"? Does criticism of the play really *centre* round the question: "Was Hamlet, at any time, or in any sense, really mad"? Of course he was *not* mad. The central question is: "Why does Hamlet not act?" Is Horatio "a straightforward, upright soldier", or is he a philosophizing scholar? — However, these things are but slight blemishes on an excellent work of sound scholarship, which I have no hesitation in recommending to all senior students.

Amsterdam.

H. DE GROOT.

### Mainly about Prosody.

*The Principles of English Metre*. By EGERTON SMITH, M.A. Principal and Professor of English, Krishnagar College. — Milford (Oxf. U. P.), 1923. — 12/6.

*Principles of English Prosody*. By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE. Part I: The Elements. — Secker, 1923. — 5/—.

*A Book of English Prosody*. By SYDNEY GREW. — Grant Richards, 1924. — 6/—.

Each of these three books has much to recommend it. The writer of the first has cast his net widest and, treating his subjects as a schoolman should, historically and systematically, has been exhaustive without becoming exhausting. Number two, written by a professor who is a poet as well, is exclusively concerned with fundamentals, and purports to be 'only an introduction' to the study of the subject. The third is the work of a practical elocutionist, reciter and musician, an English Albert Vogel. A man chiefly desirous to become an efficient reader to his classes had better take Sydney Grew for first guide, squeezing out of him every hint, every 'tip', every 'wrinkle'. He does make an occasional slip; he does assume that the modern pronunciation of Niagara obtained in the eighteenth century as well, and he falls foul of Goldsmith's irreproachable line

And Niagara stuns with thund'ring sound, —

but these blemishes are immaterial.<sup>1)</sup> A more serious offence is to be found on page 147, where in the line

And the brooks glittered on

<sup>1)</sup> Another line he objects to on similar grounds is Byron's

[They melt into thy yeast of waves, which mar  
Alike the Armada's pride or spoils of Trafalgar, —

but Byron, who had been in Spain, was right in stressing as he did, and the current pronunciation, due perhaps to the influence of Cornish names like *Trelawney* and *Trevelyan*, is wrong.

Grew hears an anapest followed by a dactyl; surely by the laws of Latin as well as of English prosody *glittered on* is an anapest. The author is simply led astray, by the *tt*, and this again appears a venial sin when compared with the enormities into which English spelling betrays no less a man than Dean Inge, who in *The Times Literary Supplement* for December 24th 1925, maintains that 'there are no longer syllables in the language than' . . . the first syllables of *hollow, horrid, torrent, battle!* A reading of Poe's *Raven* with lines like

'And his eyes have all the *seeming* of a *demon* that is *dreaming*'

should be enough to prove how untenable this statement is. And yet even this may be forgiven, seeing that stress, quantity and pitch play each their part in rhythm, and that most theorists mix up these three elements, and that many of them, striving to be monistic at all cost, ignore both quantity and pitch. Small wonder if they come to grief then, as e.g. Lascelles Abercrombie does, writing (page 23 of his book) that 'in the line

In Cedar, Marble, Ivory or Gold

the rhythm is given by the four accents on the italicized vowel sounds, and the rhythmic character requires no assistance from the quantity of these vowels; the first of them, for example, being of the same quantity as the unaccented syllables which precede and follow it.' I pass by the amazing statement that the quantity of the *ē* in 'Cedar' is equal to that of *ī* in 'in' and to that of *ə* in 'ar'. I merely invite the reader to pronounce *Ivory* with the initial vowel short (*i*) and to observe that in this case the rhythm of the whole line goes to pieces. Sydney Grew again has some vague notions about the value and function of pitch, but he never finds an adequate formula. After stating that 'words like *harp-player* are sometimes used with the second syllable in strongest metrical place' he gives instances like

Where the shrew-mouse with pale throat  
Burrows, and the speckled stoat,  
Where the quick *sandpipers* flit  
In and out the marl and grit.

(Browning's *Paracelsus*, V).

But both in the case of Robert's *sandpipers* and in that of Elizabeth's *wood-ivy* ('And wood-ivy like a spirit . . .' *Lost Bower* XX.) we find that (in order to salve our rhythmic conscience) one syllable (the first of the combination) has been given *pitch* to assert its superiority over the merely *stressed* second syllable.<sup>1)</sup>

There is a thing that vitiates much of Abercrombie's argument: he is chiefly concerned with Milton's blank verse and his instances are almost exclusively from *Paradise Lost*. Now I remember a saying of Matthew Arnold's that 'for the English artist in any line, if he is a true artist, the study of Milton may well have an indescribable attraction. It gives him lessons which nowhere else from an Englishman's work can he obtain.' And yet I venture to demur. Being a poet of acknowledged standing Lascelles Abercrombie should have drawn on his own poems for examples.

<sup>1)</sup> Compare certain Dutch lines of my own in *De Gids*, (Nov. 1925):

En weer *zon-blinken*, schimmig-luw  
Door 't scherpe  
*Kieft-fluiten*, 't hard *eend-snaatren*, 't ruw  
*Meeuw-snerpen*.

Pitch and stress running counter we obtain an effect similar to that of syncopation in music.

For if a poet (as I maintain) writes not for himself but for his readers, it is equally true that he necessarily tests the effects of his rhythms by his own ear. The *exact* stress, quantity and pitch of successive syllables do not matter: we want to know how they strike the ear. There are prosodists who lose sight of this, perpetrating ridiculous irrelevancies e.g. by declaring Shakespeare's

Like horse, hound, hog, bear, fire, at every turn

to be impossible of scansion. Although two successive ticks of a clock are exactly alike they produce the impression of rhythm (trochees or iambics *ad libitum!*) and similarly it is enough for a poet to create a sufficiently strong impression of rhythm, even if this impression be partly illusion.

Egerton Smith is perfectly right: 'metrists have assumed a degree of homogeneity which is not actually found' (Preface). Therefore he sets most store by the dicta of the poets themselves. But few dicta are available. There should be far more and it is up to the poets to give them. And *these dicta should henceforth be supplemented and illustrated by a great number of phonographic records*. Then at last it will be possible to lay the firm foundations for a theory of rhythm and metre. Meanwhile books like the three mentioned are not only useful but indispensable, resembling dictionaries in that the worst is better than none. But I repeat, all three are very good of their kind. Incidentally I may observe that whereas Egerton Smith cherishes the belief that *few will impugn the fineness of Swinburne's ear*, I have ventured to do this at some length in *Neophilologus* (1924-1925) and that my challenge has not yet been taken up.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

## Current Letters and Philology.

### 2. Fiction.

Some years ago a bold Jeremiah, or even more than one, proclaimed that the public was growing weary of the novel, which would therefore soon have to abdicate its dominant position in favour of the short story. There is as yet not the least sign that their doleful prophecy will come true. On the contrary, the interest in this form of art appears to increase rather than to be on the wane. Novels continue to be plentiful and even "first novels" seem to have become what they call in America a "business proposition", unless we are to assume that the publishers who bring them out in larger numbers than ever are merely actuated by altruism. Patient and competent persons have calculated that the entire output of new novels in England in 1925 amounts to little less than fifteen hundred and in spite of various strikes in the publishing world the new year bids fair to equal this astounding production. For a reviewer such fertility has one obvious advantage: he need not as usual try to find a specious apology for incompleteness. An adequate survey is out of the question. We only want to draw the attention to some novels and stories which we consider the most remarkable among the very small percentage of the rich crop we have been able to read.

Of the authors with an unshakeably established reputation Mr. H. G. Wells claims pride of place again this year. *Christina Alberta's Father*, (London, J. Cape), perhaps the greatest success of 1925, is one of the best novels this surprisingly virile artist and thinker has given us yet. It is a long complicated story, interesting in all its phases, with several delightful, vividly realised, original personages and at the same time a brilliant study of various aspects of modern society. There is a thread of symbolism in it, but the Utopian ideals with which the author was preoccupied in his two preceding novels: "Men like Gods" and "The Dream", have this time been kept entirely in the background. The satire it contains is mellowed by a deep love of humanity and a firm belief in the future. There are also many witty, irresistibly comic passages; in a great part of it, indeed, a light humorous tone prevails.

Joseph Conrad's unfinished novel *Suspense* (Dent & Tauchnitz) has already been discussed in a separate article in this journal (by J. de Gruyter, E. S. VII, 169). Another

posthumous publication has since appeared, which, though slighter, deserves equal attention: *Tales of Hearsay* (Fisher Unwin & Tauchnitz), a collection of four short stories. "The Black Mate" has only little artistic value, but it is interesting as being the first tale Conrad ever wrote (1884). The other three are of much later date and rank with his best work. Especially: "The Warrior's Soul", based on an episode from the Napoleonic wars in Russia is a poignantly beautiful, unforgettable tale.

Mr. Frank Swinnerton deals with London life of the lower middle-classes in his love-story: *The Elder Sister* (Martin Secker & Tauchnitz). In subject and treatment it follows old, established traditions and is in parts reminiscent of George Gissing. It is a carefully, even almost symmetrically, built novel, a very clever, calmly objective study of real life. Most of the characters are completely convincing and the simple story therefore holds the attention to the last. But it awakens satisfaction and thoughtful appreciation rather than surprise or enthusiasm.

Sheila Kaye-Smith's *The George and The Crown* (Cassell) belongs to the same category. Her craftsmanship is almost, though not quite as good as Swinnerton's and her latest novel as clever, graphic and true to life as any one of her former books. But there is nothing new in her vision of life, she is a very good psychologist, a skilful narrator, but not a deep or strikingly original personality. It seems that Hugh Walpole, another talented, but often somewhat conventional novelist, has made a strong, an almost violent effort at producing something quite original this time. Uncommon the result: *Portrait of a Man with Red Hair* (Macmillan & Tauchnitz) may certainly be called. Powerful and interesting too. The weird, cruel story has a peculiarly harsh, glittering brilliancy and some haunting passages, but there is little genuine feeling in it; it is too obviously made by order of the intellect.

Admirers of the late Katherine Mansfield's wonderful, well nigh perfect short stories (in "Bliss", "The Garden Party", "The Dove's Nest" etc.) will welcome the reprint of her first book: *In A German Pension* (Constable) which had been a long time inaccessible. Taking her age into consideration — she was barely nineteen when she wrote these stories and sketches of German life — we consider the book a truly astonishing achievement. It shows a power of observation, a technical ability, a wit and worldly wisdom quite unusual in one so young. She had not yet attained the crystal clearness of vision, the warm-hearted love and deep understanding, the serene acceptance of life of her later, all too brief, period. She is still a little unjust to her characters, a little supercilious and at times one-sidedly, almost cruelly critical. But even the slightest of the sketches in this early volume are clever, interesting and often very amusing. Towards the end of the book there is already a distinct change of tone; and there are some stories in it near akin in spirit and hardily inferior to her best work.

After Katherine Mansfield's early death Ethel Colburn Mayne is generally considered the chief authoress of short stories in England. *Inner Circle* (Constable), her latest volume, is a characteristic achievement. She is a very conscientious artist, who usually chooses a simple theme, often taken from life in the higher circles of London society. She paints with deft little touches the subtlest nuances of an emotional atmosphere and penetrates deeply into the spiritual life of her personages. A few of the stories in "Inner Circle" suffer from artificiality and over-subtlety and they are not always easy to follow, but the majority are worthy of her high reputation.

The well-known poet Martin Armstrong has proved that he can write beautifully graphic narrative prose likewise. *The Goat and Compasses* (J. Cape) is one of the most charming novels of the year 1925. It is a study of life in a small, sleepy seaside-place; a chronicle full of colour, gentle humour and picturesque characterisation.

A kind of chronicle too is Sarah Gertrude Millin's novel *God's Stepchildren* (Constable), which relates in a simple, but very effective style the history of four generations of half-castes in South Africa. Most of them have to cope with great difficulties and suffer much by the universal prejudice against people of their breed. Their tragic experiences are touchingly told and several of the characters remain clearly in the memory, especially their ancestor, a pious, kindly, but dull-witted missionary, who, placed at an outpost, where he is the only white man, marries a Hottentot-girl and sinks gradually away into despondency and madness. This year she has followed up her remarkable success with an almost equally impressive book: *Mary Glenn* (Constable).

Another South African authoress of unmistakeable talent is Pauline Smith. She has as yet published only one volume of short stories: *The Little Karoo* (J. Cape), episodes from the lives of Dutch farmers in a remote district of the Cape Colony. But this honest, straightforward work, full of pathos and genuine feeling, shows a grip upon reality and a power of invention which makes one feel confident that she will also succeed in more ambitious efforts.

A very fertile young writer, whose name has of late quickly come to the fore, is the Irishman Liam O'Flaherty. In *Spring Sowing* (J. Cape) a volume of short, mostly

very short stories, he gave us a series of crisp, energetic, very suggestive pen-pictures mainly of the lower classes in Ireland. In his latest novel: *The Informer* (J. Cape) he shows that he can also handle a more important and intricate theme. It describes the feverish, dangerous life in the slums of Dublin during the recent revolutionary broils. It is a tale of great dramatic power and the informer himself and several of his chums and enemies are admirably drawn.

To readers who take an interest in historical novels we can recommend the work of Naomi Mitchison. In *Cloud Cuckoo Land* we find two attractive qualities combined: it is a stirring tale and gives a very vivid picture of life and manners in Greece during the last years of the Peloponnesian war. A historical novel built on more conventional lines, but of sound workmanship and considerable imaginative power is *The Unhurrying Chase* by H. E. M. Prescott. It leads us back to the Middle Ages in France and the main theme is the conversion of the hero, who even as a very young man felt vague inclinations to the mystic and religious life, which he tries in vain to suppress.

March 1926.

A. G. v. K.

### Brief Mentions.

*Origins and Meanings of Popular Phrases and Names, including those which came into use during the Great War.* By BASIL HARGRAVE. London, T. Werner Laurie, 1925. [376 pp. 7/6].

We had hoped great things from Mr. Hargrave's volume but regret to say that the book is worse than useless. Fanciful etymologies (e.g. dogwatch < dodgewatch) abound and the many inaccuracies and generally chaotic character of Mr. Hargrave's work make it extremely hard to account for the fact that a second edition was called for. The author's explanation of the double pronunciation of the word *Ache* shows that he must have had little if any philological training. Baret in his *Alvearie* (1580) points out the proper distinction in the spelling of this word according as it is used as a verb (ake) or noun (ache). Compare speak-speech; bake-batch and see the Oxford Dictionary on *Ache*. — P. J. H. O. S.

*Die Englische Lektüre im Rahmen eines kultatkundlichen Unterrichts.* Von WALTER HÜBNER. Pp. 62. Teubner, 1925. Geh. M. 2.40; geb. M. 3.20.

Far too little attention is paid in this country to the new movement in the teaching of modern languages in Germany. To those who wish to know something about it, this little book can be warmly recommended. It may be doubted whether 'Kultatkunde' as the main object of language teaching would appeal to most Dutch teachers; and I do not say that it would be a good thing if it did. But the way such questions are taken up by our German colleagues contrasts favourably with the indifference that is unfortunately but too common here. We are too busy taking degrees. — Z.

### Errata.

February number, p. 26, l. 4, instead of *na* read *da*; l. 11, for *Jemitism* read *Jesuitism*; l. 19, cancel full stop; l. 22, for *alabo* read *alato*; last line but one, change full stop after *sofferto* into comma.

## Bibliography.

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.<sup>1)</sup>

*Table-Talk of G.B.S.* Conversations on things in general between Bernard Shaw and his biographer. By ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, 7<sup>3/4</sup> × 5<sup>1/4</sup>, xi + 191 pp. Chapman and Hall, 1925. 5s. n.

*Herbert Trench, poète anglais.* (1865-1923). Par A. CHEVALLEY. 53 pp. Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925.

*The Idea of Great Poetry.* By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE. Pp. 232. Secker, 1925. 6/- 1st. [See Curr. Lett., Febr. n.r.]

1) The list of new books will be brought up to date in the next number.

*Thamyris, or Is There a Future for Poetry?* By R. C. TREVELYAN.  $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , 89 pp. Kegan Paul. 1925. 2s. 6d. n.

*Anglica. Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie* Alois Brandl zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage überreicht. Bd. I: Sprache und Kulturgeschichte; II: Literaturgeschichte. 8vo. 184; 474 pp. Leipzig: Mayer und Müller. 1925. (Palaestra 147, 148.)

*Philhelvetism.* By EDUARD ZIEHEN. 8vo. 48 pp. Marburg a. d. Lahn. Elwert 1925. — Die neueren Sprachen. Beiheft 4. M. 1,50.

*W. P. Ker, 1855—1923. Memoir* by R. W. CHAMBERS. 1925. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI) Royal 8vo ( $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 14. Paper cover. O.U.P. 1s. 6d. net.

This pamphlet by Mr. R. W. Chambers, with accounts of Ker's undergraduate days by Professor MacCunn and of his Oxford work by Professor Mackail, is at once a concise biography and a profound appreciation. It should be read with Sir Gregory Foster's Memoir in E. S. V., 163 ff.

*Collected Essays of W. P. Ker.* In Two Volumes. Edited, with an Introduction, by CHARLES WHIBLEY.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ . Vol. I., xxi. + 362 pp.; Vol. II., vi. + 352 pp. Macmillan. 1925. 25s. n.

*Occidental Gleanings.* By LAFCADIO HEARN. Sketches and essays now first collected by ALBERT MORDELL. In two volumes.  $9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , Vol. I., xlvi. + 275 pp. Vol. II., ix. + 289 pp. Heinemann. 1925. 30s. n.

*Fools and Philosophers: A Gallery of Comic Figures from English Literature.* Arranged by J. B. PRIESTLEY.  $7 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , xii. + 299 pp. John Lane. 1925. 6s. n.

*Silhouettes.* By SIR EDMUND GOSSE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , x. + 413 pp. Heinemann. 1925. 8s. 6d. n.

*Later Days.* By W. H. DAVIES.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 223 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1925. 6s. n.

#### LANGUAGE.

*Probleme der englischen Sprache und Kultur.* Festschrift Johannes Hoops zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht von Freunden und Kollegen. Herausgegeben von WOLFGANG KELLER. vii. + 270 pp. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1925. Geh. 15.— Mk., geb. 17.50 Mk.

*Das Bahuvihi-Compositum in Altenglischen, Mittelenglischen und Neuenglischen.* Von WERNER LAST. Mit einem Geleitwort von Heinr. Spies. 8vo. 124 pp. Greifswald: Adler. 1925. M. 3.—

*Second Supplement to the Glossary of the Dialect of Cumberland.* By E. W. PREVOST. 1924. 8vo. ( $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ ), pp. 44. *Publications of the Philological Society IX.* Milford. 2s. 6d. net.

*Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* Classified and arranged so as to facilitate the expression of ideas and to assist in literary composition. By PETER MARK ROGET, F.R.S. Enlarged by JOHN LEWIS ROGET. New edition, revised and enlarged (1925) By SAMUEL ROMILLY ROGET.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xlvi. + 691 pp. Longmans. 1925. 7s. 6d. n.

*Speech Training for Scottish Students.* By WILLIAM GRANT and ELIZABETH H. A. ROBSON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , xiv. + 128 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1925. 5s.

A new edition, largely rewritten, of "The Pronunciation of English in Scotland," first published in 1913.

*Places and Place-Names Round Alyth.* By JAMES MEIKLE.  $9 \times 6$ , 203 pp. Paisley: A. Gardner. 1925.

*City Street Names.* The Names of the Streets, Lanes, Alleys, and Courts of the City of London. (Second edition, revised and augmented.) By LOUIS ZETTERSTEN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ . 92 pp. John Schele (110, Cannon-street, E.C. 4). 1925. 15s.

#### HISTORY; BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth-Century England.* The Ford Lectures 1923—4. By C. L. KINGSFORD. 8vo (9×6). pp. 216, with 2 maps. Milford, 1925. 15s. net.

*The Fall of the Monasteries and the Social Changes in England leading up to the Great Revolution.* By S. B. LILJEGREN. Pp. 150. Lund, Gleerup; Leipzig, Harassowitz. [Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. I. Bd. 19. Nr. 10]. Printed 1924. [A review will appear.]

#### PERIODICALS.

*Neophilologus.* XI, 2. Jan. 1926. Includes: H. A. W. Speckmann, The cipher inscription on the monument of William Shakespeare at Stratford-on-Avon. (117-125). — A review, by J. A. Falconer, of *Dibelius, England*. (154-157).

*The Modern Language Review.* XXI, 1. Jan. 1926. Includes: Carleton Brown, A thirteenth-century MS. at Maidstone. I. — R. C. Goffin, Chaucer and 'Reason'. — P. Z. Round, Greene's materials for 'Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay'. — R. W. King, Italian influence on English scholarship and literature during the Romantic Revival, VI. — A review, by J. G. Robertson, of Prinsen, *De Roman in de 18<sup>e</sup> Eeuw in West-Europa*.

**The Review of English Studies.** II, 5. Jan. 1926. C. H. Firth, Dean Swift and ecclesiastical preferment. — O. F. Emerson, Originality in Old English poetry. — B. M. Ward, George Gascoigne and his circle. — P. Simpson, The genuineness of the Drummond "Conversations". — A. Milner-Barry, A note on the early literary relations of Oliver Goldsmith and Thomas Percy. — A. W. Reed, Literary research in London. — J. Platt, The development of English colloquial idiom during the 18<sup>th</sup> century. — Notes and Observations. — Reviews.

**Modern Languages.** VII, 2. Dec. 1925. Includes M. G. Devonshire, The Teaching of Modern Languages in Norway, Denmark and Holland. — **Id.** VII, 3/4. Febr. 1926. G. F. Bridge, Mr. John Buchan on Sir Walter Scott.

**Modern Language Notes.** XL, 8. Dec. 1925. Includes: J. A. Walz, 'Aldermann', a supposed Anglicism in German. — T. Brooke, Shake-Speare's moiety of the Stratford tithes. — W. P. Mustard, Notes on Thomas Nashe's Works. — J. N. D. Bush, Martin Parker's *Philomela*. — E. F. Shewmake, Laws of pronunciation in Eastern Virginia. — **Id.** XLI, 1. Jan. 1926. Includes: M. P. Tilley, A parody of 'Euphues' in 'Romeo and Juliet.' — B. Brown, Robert of Gloucester's 'Chronicle' and the 'Life of St. Kenelm.' — **Id.** XLI, 2. Febr. 1926. Includes: R. G. Ham, Otway's duels with Churchill and Settle. — R. D. Havens, William Somervile's earliest poem.

**Philological Quarterly.** V, 1. Jan. 1926. Includes: C. L. Finney, Keats's philosophy of beauty: an interpretation of the allegory of *Endymion* in the light of the neo-Platonism of Spenser. — E. Macmillan, The plays of Isaac Bickerstaff in America. — R. S. Forsythe, Notes on The Spanish Tragedy. — W. P. Mustard, Notes on Thomas Kyd's works.

**Studies in Philology.** XXIII, 1. Jan. 1926. American Studies: Second Series. R. E. Spiller, The English literary horizon: 1815-1835 (as seen by the American traveller). — G. L. Paine, The Indians of the leather-stockings tales. — A. L. Reed, Self-portraiture in the works of Nathaniel Hawthorne. — F. T. Thompson, Emerson's indebtedness to Coleridge. — J. B. Moore, The Master of Whitman. — E. E. Leisy, Materials for investigations in American literature. A report compiled for the American Literature group of the Modern Language Association.

**The Journal of English and Germanic Philology.** XXIV, 3. July 1925. Includes: M. P. Tilley, Two Shakespearean Notes. — R. Kelso, Sixteenth century definitions of the Gentleman in England. — E. C. Baldwin, Paradise Lost and the Apocalypse of Moses. — W. A. Craigie, The nationality of King Alfred's *Wulfstan*. — **Id.** XXIV, 4. Oct. 1925. Includes: E. K. Heller, Studies on the story of Gawain in Crestien and Wolfram. — R. F. Jones, A conjecture on the Wife of Bath's Prologue. — W. Graham, Some predecessors of the *Tatler*.

**The Yale Review.** Jan. 1926. Includes: Conrad's Diary, edited by Richard Curle. — M. A. De Wolfe Howe, A Jane Austen letter. — H. MacAfee, Some novelists in mid-stream.

**Language.** Journal of the Linguistic Society of America. Vol. I, nr. 1. March, 1925. L. Bloomfield, Why a Linguistic Society? — Reports of the organization meeting, etc. — I, 2. June, 1925. Includes: E. Sapir, Sound patterns in language. — I, 3. Sept. 1925. Includes: R. E. Parker, Spenser's language and the pastoral tradition.

**Revue de Littérature Comparée.** VI, 1. Jan.-Mars 1926. Includes: D. Saurat, La "Sapience" de Spenser et la "Schekhina" de la Cabale. — M. Fuchs, Banville inspiré par Shelley. — Reviews.

**Revue Anglo-Américaine.** III, 2 Déc. 1925. Mad. L. Cazamian, John Galsworthy: Hier et Aujourd'hui. — J. Cate, Emily Dickinson. II. L'Oeuvre. — Ch. Cestre, L'Antiévolutionnisme aux Etats-Unis. — G. Lafourcade, Atalanta in Calydon. Le Manuscrit, les Sources. II. — Reviews, including one of Pompéi, The English Versions of The Ship of Fools, by E. Legouis. — **Id.** III, 3 Févr. 1926. F. Delattre, Sur deux ouvrages récents d'Arnold Bennett. — R. Brugère, Sean O'Casey et le Théâtre irlandais. — P. Descamps, Les origines de la coéducation en Amérique. — R. Galland, W. P. Ker (1855-1923). — E. Legouis, Wordsworth et Colette. — A. Digeon, "Gulliver" et La Bruyère.

**Les Langues Modernes.** XXIV, 1 Janv.-Févr. 1926. F. C. Danchin, Cathédrales, Abbayes, Eglises fameuses d'Angleterre (I). — Reviews.

**Revue de l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes.** Janv. 1926. C. Pitolle, Edgar Allan Poe.

**Le Navire d'Argent.** Juin—Nov. 1925. Bibliographie de la littérature anglaise traduite en français. — Sept. 1925. Numéro consacré à William Blake.

**Revue des Deux Mondes.** 15 Oct. 1925. F. Roz, L'esprit nouveau du roman américain.

**Revue de France.** 1 Oct. 1925. P. Dottin, Jonathan Swift d'après son dernier biographe. — 1 Jan. 1926. P. Dottin, Une grande romancière australienne: Mrs. Gunn.

**Le Correspondant.** 25 Déc. 1925. F. Baldensperger, Un romancier américain d'aujourd'hui: M. Sinclair Lewis.

**Anglia.** XLIX = N.F. XXXVII, 1925, 3. J. Koch, Der gegenwärtige Stand der Chaucerforschung. — F. C. Steinermayr, Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt und Kunstanschauung II. — Hugo Lange, Neue Beiträge zu einer endgültigen Lösung der Legendenprologfrage bei Chaucer II. — S. J. Crawford, The Cædmon poems. — Otto S. Schlueter, Bemerkungen zum NE. Dictionary.

**Beiblatt zur Anglia.** 36, 10-12 (Oct. to Dec. 1925). Reviews, including an appreciative notice of De Foe's dissertation on Sterne, by Fehr; also Liebermann on Schmidt, Der Volkswille als realer faktor des verfassungsliebens und Daniel Defoe; Liljegren on Veldkamp's book on Samuel Butler, and other literary works; Fehr on Boillot, The Methodical Study of Literature, and other works. Also some short articles on Arnold Bennett (by Fehr), an Anglosaxon legal text (by Liebermann) and two notes on Modern English syntax (Ellinger, and Jespersen in answer to Miss Björling). — **Id.** 37, 1-3 (Jan.—March 1926). Reviews and Short Articles, including Ekwall's note on Ablaut in flussnamen and Liljegren, Milton and the King's Prayer.

**Englische Studien.** LX, 1. 1925. This number is dedicated to Professor Joseph Wright, who celebrated his 70th birthday in October last. It opens with a short account of Professor Wright's life and work, which must unfortunately be incomplete, for work is by no means over yet for this veteran scholar. The other articles are: L. L. Schücking, Waldere und Waltharius. — G. Hübener, König Alfred und Osteuropa. — Max Förster, Die altenglischen traumlunare. — F. Liebermann, Vorstufen zur staatlichen einheit Britanniens bis 1066. — Holthausen, Grammatisches. — W. Horn, Die entwicklung des mittenglischen kurzen u im neuenglischen. — K. Luick, Zu ne. halfpenny. — A. Eichler, 'Master' als höflichkeitswort in Shakespeares dramen. — O. Funke, Jespersen's lehre von den Three Ranks. — K. Brunner, Die schreibtradition der dialektsschriftsteller von Lancashire. — B. Fehr, James Joyces *Ulysses*. — Reviews of Wright's Old English Grammar, and of his Elementary Historical New English Grammar.

**Germ. Rom. Monatsschrift.** XIII, 9/10 (Sept.—Oct. 1925). Includes an In Memoriam to Wilhelm Streitberg (by Victor Michels); H. Grimme, Neuhochd. Sprachmelodik II.; M. J. Wolff, Shakespeares Form. — **Id.** XIII, 11/12 (Nov.—Dec. 1925). Includes a notice on Professor H. Hirt on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. — H. Conrad, Byrons "Müssige Stunden." — **Id.** XIV, 1/2 (Jan.—Febr. 1926). Includes K. Jäger, Idealistische Neuphilologie. — L. v. Hibler, Lord Byron in seinen Parlamentsreden.

**Literaturblatt für Germ. u. Rom. Phil.** 46, 11/12 (Nov.—Dec. 1925). Reviews, including Flasdieck on Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage. — **Id.** 47, 1/2 and 3/4 (Jan.—April 1926). Includes Flasdieck on the publications of the Place Name Society. — Hilka on Loomis, Illustrations of medieval romance on tiles from Chertsey Abbey.

**Die neueren Sprachen.** XXXIII, 1925, 4. Juli—Aug. Includes: Th. Aronstein, Das englische Renaissancetheater. — 5. Sept./Okt. Includes: O. L. Jiriczek, Zu Hamlet II, 2, 156. — Leo Hannauer, Das einsilbige Wort im englischen Vers. — 6. Nov./Dez. Includes: Berthold Cron, Ueber Wesen und Bedeutung der englischen Volksliedbewegung. — Margarete Rösler, Congreves "Double Dealer" in deutscher Uebersetzung. — Reviews, including Ehrke on Geyl and Kruisinga, England in the 19th Century I — **Id.** XXXIV, 1 and 2 (Jan.—Febr. and March—April 1926). Includes K. Brunner, Wirtschaftslage und Literatur. — Fröschels u. Trojan, Experimentalphonetische Studie zur theorie des satzes. — K. Arns, John Drinkwater als Dramatiker. — E. Rosenbach, Eine neue Shaw-monographie. — Reviews, including Achtnich on Kruisinga, English Grammar for Dutch Students. Also a note by H. Koziol against the phonetic article mentioned above.

**Die neueren Sprachen.** Beiheft 5a. Ewald Scherpding, Englischer Unterricht auf der Oberstufe nach der direkten Methode. 3. Teil zu Englisch nach dem Frankfurter Reformplan von Max Walter. — 6. Neusprachliche Studien. Festgabe Karl Luick zu seinem 60. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern. Includes 24 articles by Sievers, Meyer—Lübke, Förster, Helene Richter, Ekwall, Scripture, Ettmayer, Eichler etc. — [7. Not yet published]. — 8. Eberhard Moosmann, Shakespeares König Heinrich IV. T. I. Eine Vorlesung für Primaner in englischer Sprache. — 9. Eberhard Moosmann, Shakespeares Macbeth. Eine Vorlesung für Primaner in englischer Sprache.

**Zeitschrift für französischen und englischen Unterricht.** XXIV, 1925, 3. Includes K. Horn, Drei Lieder der Vergänglichkeit (von Shelley und D. G. Rossetti) übertragen und erläutert. — K. Arns, Vier Jahrzehnte Presse und Bühne in New York. — **Id.** 4. Includes: W. Schütz, Englisch als erste Fremdsprache. — K. Arns, Viktorianer in der englischen Dichtung der Gegenwart. — **Id.** 5. Includes: K. Arns, Reformen und Reformpläne im englischen Theaterwesen. — Friedr. Bitzkat: Robert Browning, My last Duchess. — Herm. Engel, Shaw und die Schule. — Adolf Jungenhülsing, Mein Studienaufenthalt in England.

**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** N. F. Jg. II, 1925. Nr. 37. H. Lüdeke on Van Wyck Brooks, The Ordeal of Mark Twain, and on Friedr. Schönemann, Mark Twain als literarische Persönlichkeit. — **Id.** 40. Wilh. Horn on Ph. Aronstein, Englische Stilistik. — **Id.** 41. Bernh. Fehr on Heinr. Caspari, Edgar Allan Poes Verhältnis zum Okkultismus.

**Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendliteratur.** I, 1925, 3. Includes: W. Hübner, Auslandskunde: Englisch (Sprache, Philosophie, Geschichte). — **Id.** 4. Includes: Wilh. Willig, Shakespeare als Dichter der Wiedergeburt. — **Id.** 5. Includes: Hans Leisegang, Bernard Shaws Heilige Johanna. — **Id.** 6. Includes: Fritz Karpf, Dibelius Englandbuch und die Auslandskunde. — Walter Hübner, Auslandskunde: Englisch (Literaturgeschichte; Amerika).

**Die Literatur.** Formerly: Das literarische Echo. XXVII, 12, Sept. 1925. Includes: Max Meyerfeld, Jung-England. — P. Selver, Englischer Brief. — A. Busse, Amerikanischer Brief. — XXVIII, 2, Nov. 1925. Includes: H. Hesse, Ein Neger als Dichter (Claude Mackay).

**Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland.** Jg. LXXVI, 1925, Nr. 1 (15 Jan.) — Nr. 24 (15 Dez.) Each number includes lists and notices of books and articles of a scholarly character, dealing with English and American language and literature, by Egon Mühlbach.

**Jahrbuch für Philologie.** Hg. v. Klemperer und Lerch. Vol. 1, 1925. Includes: Joseph Hergesheimer, Ein Beitrag zur neuesten Amerikanischen Literaturgeschichte.

**Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur.** IL, 1925, 2/3 Ed. Sievers, *Theodoice snad*. — **Id.** L, 1. Includes Eduard Sievers, ags. *hlafdige*.

**Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur.** LXII, 1925, 3. Includes: Rudolf Much, Widith. Beiträge zu einem Commentar.

**Giessener Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache und Kultur Englands und Nordamerikas.** Bd. III, 1925, H. 1. Includes: Leon Stahl, Der adnominalen genitiv und sein Ersatz im Mittelenglischen und Frühneuenglischen. — Ernst Kaffenberger, Englische Lautlehre nach Thomas Sheridans Dictionary of the English Language (1780). — Karl Beysel, Die Namen der Blutsverwandtschaft im Englischen.

**Jahrbuch der philos. Fakultät der Philipps-Universität zu Marburg.** 1922-1923. I. Philologisch-historische Abteilung. Marburg 1924. Includes summaries respectively titles of the following dissertations: Bentheim, Symbol und Mythus bei Keats. — Grand, Die Betonung der Nominalkomposita in Neuenglischen. — Intyre, Der Gebrauch der Farbe in Rossetti's Dichtung. — Kellermann, James Withcomb Riley. — Kerl, Das Hendiadyoin bei Shakespeare. — Komminck, Studien über John Ruskin als Literatkritiker. — Meinholt, Kontrastfiguren in den Romanen Thackerays. — Schulte-Braucks, Zur Geschichte des englischen Essays von Montaigne bis Cowley. — Tesche, Das Naturgefühl bei Meredith.

**Jahrbuch der philosophischen Fakultät der deutschen Universität in Prag.** Dekanatsjahr 1923-1924. 8vo, 42 pp. Prag: Calve 1925. Includes: Robert Anger, Aktionsarten des Verbums in Aelfrics Homilien. Phil. Diss. 1924. [Auszug.] — G. Busch, Die Ausblicke in den Historien und Tragödien Shakespeare's, ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der dramatischen Technik des Dichters. Phil. Diss. 1924. [Auszug.]

**Litteris.** II, 3. Dec. 1925. Includes: Fune on Jespersen, The Philosophy of Grammar. — Stern on Schirmer, Antike, Renaissance und Puritanismus. — Liljegren on Pompen, The English Versions of *The Ship of Fools*.

**Moderna Språk.** 19, 6-9 (Sept. to Dec. 1925). Includes: E. Terner, on the gramophone in modern language teaching. Also examination papers in Swedish secondary schools. Reviews. — **Id.** 20, 1/2 (Febr. 1926). Includes notes on the word *umpteen*; and accounts of the attempts to reach unity of phonetic transcription in Swedish schoolbooks (It seems generally agreed upon to base any phonetic spelling on that of the Ass. Phon. Intern.)

**La Critica.** Nov. 1925. Contains a review by Benedetto Croce of Orlo Williams, *Contemporary Criticism of Literature*, London, 1924.

## H. POUTSMA.

The hope once expressed by Professor Deutschbein when reviewing an earlier volume of the *Grammar of Late Modern English* by H. Poutsma (Noordhoff, Groningen) has now been fulfilled: the last volume, a book of nearly nine hundred pages, has just been published. Foreign periodicals will soon take notice of this as an important event in the study of living English, but a journal that represents the study of English in Holland should surely be the first. We are happy in being able to congratulate the author that the result of his self-denying devotion to learning during a long series of years, the best years of his life, indeed, has come to a final close before his seventieth birthday in December next. The work stands forth as an unexampled monument of the lifelong study of a living modern language, and the life, if not unexampled in the annals of scholarship, is certainly exemplary. For no reward, whether of a material, or of another kind in the form of academic posts or even academic recognition, has ever fallen to Poutsma's share, and all he ever expected or desired has been the recognition of the value of his labours. This has undoubtedly fallen to his lot, if not from the official representatives of English studies in his own country, at any rate from those in other countries. The position of Poutsma's book among students of English in Germany and America is well assured, and as to the Scandinavian countries it will interest our readers that the book was recommended as early as 1913 to students of the university of Upsala, in the official *Filosofiska Fakultetens Studiehandbok*. The completion of the book will naturally strengthen its position, and there seems no doubt that for a long time to come it will be one of the most indispensable books of reference in the libraries of those who take the study of the living stage of English seriously.

There is probably no parallel to Poutsma's book for any living language. Up to its appearance such a minute treatment had only been applied to the classical stages of Latin and Greek and perhaps to the Greek of the New Testament. Poutsma's treatment is very similar to that in the works referred to. Like them he does not pay attention to the phonetic side of the language; he was, indeed, able to ignore this altogether, because it had been sufficiently done in special works dealing with this side of the language to the exclusion of the others. Another side that we may mention as omitted in Poutsma's book, of course without a particle of reproach, is the one of Word-formation; of the problems connected with it Poutsma deals only with the comparison of adjectives and adverbs, and with the conversion of words into other parts of speech. As a result, the book deals with what may be called syntax, for in any descriptive treatment of present English, accidence necessarily plays an insignificant part. The most important chapter on accidence is to be found in the last volume, in the part dealing with the verb. Poutsma's syntax does not try to attract the attention of scholars by the novelty of his arrangement. Without denying, naturally, that there is room for improvement in the way the syntax of various languages has been presented, and indeed studied as well, we must confess that in

not a few cases there has seemed to be a seeking after notoriety rather than a real wish for a better scientific treatment of the subject in some of the attempts at re-arrangement. However that may be, notoriety is the last thing desired by the author of this book; his humility is so genuine that his achievement has not made the least alteration in his attitude towards his fellow-workers, which has always been more inclined to excessive admiration than to criticism.

The performance of Poutsma becomes still more to be respected when we consider what his preparation has been for his life's work. It is more or less known in Holland, but will probably surprise many of our foreign readers. Poutsma belongs to the ever diminishing band of self-trained students, of which he, L. P. H. Eykman, M. G. van Neck and P. Roorda are almost the only living, and it may be said, the most splendid representatives. All of them began life as elementary teachers, probably not with the preparation for that task as it is now to be found at its best. They went to England, where they learned English in a better school than universities can ever supply: the school of life namely. The result, in the case of men with a natural aptitude for languages and an inborn fitness and zeal for study, was a knowledge of living English such as is surpassed by none of their younger contemporaries, and as is probably even equalled by an extremely small number among them. And the practical command of living English was not considered by these men as an end in itself: they knew too well that this command, however essential to the success of their daily work as secondary teachers, was not an achievement that might be considered final. It led Eykman and Roorda to their study of phonetics, Van Neck to his study of literature, which made him the master of a great number of teachers now working in our secondary schools. It led Poutsma to his grammatical studies, whose results have been embodied in his great book, great in more than one sense, it is true; but what reasonable person will complain of the bulk of a book of reference, if the result is that he rarely consults it in vain? Of course, the training that produced such admirable results as we have mentioned, is not set up here as an example for unchanged imitation in our day. In the first place the results are the outcome of exceptional ability: the average result was far inferior, as indeed averages have a tendency of being unsatisfactory. And even in the best men the system had a weakness: its historical study of the language. It seems difficult to study the history of a language without the help of a master; perhaps also its importance was not seen by the students of an earlier day, for even in our own time, now that the study of earlier English has become compulsory, it is far from being the general conviction that a historical study of English is of value to the future schoolmaster. At any rate, earlier students almost invariably neglected it. The omission was of little importance to the phonetic work of Eykman: it simply turned his attention and interest to experimental instead of historical phonetics. Roorda showed by his *Klankleer* that the practical study of phonetics must be based on the sounds of the student's native speech; but his energies were afterwards turned into another direction. In the case of Van Neck, the omission caused a restriction of his literary studies such as is still the rule in many English universities. In Poutsma's case its most important effect was not that it induced him to write his book from the purely descriptive standpoint — there was no objection to this — but it favoured an exclusively logical treatment of descriptive grammar that made a full understanding of the structure of the language difficult, if not impossible. But no man can be all things to all

men, and we hope that nobody will reproach us for suggesting that the work is not perfect, and leaves something to do for his successors. The author himself, we are certain, will be the last to blame us, and will be quite happy if his work is the foundation on which younger men, with a more regular linguistic training, and working under more favourable circumstances, perhaps even with the chance of official recognition, will erect a more perfect building. Will the workmen present themselves? When the study of English at the university was not rewarded by degrees, the number of full-time students was inconsiderable. Since there are degrees to reward their industry, or at least their attendance in the lecture-room, the numbers have greatly increased. Will there be men among them who establish a Dutch school of historical English syntax? Will the work of Eykman and Roorda be completed by a band of Dutchmen studying the history of English sounds? And will the work of Van Neck be continued by the younger men now studying at the universities or just completing their studies by publications on the earlier periods of English literature? Time will show: it will be the only justification of the high claims that have been made for the university organisation of these studies.

---

## Edmund Spenser and Jonker Jan van der Noot.

(Conclusion.)

But these things, nor the fact that the *Theatre* was the first book of "emblemata" published in England and that it inspired the edition de luxe of the "Ship of Fools" in 1570, do not alone secure a safe niche for the *Theatre* as a noteworthy production. Grosart and, more recently, Galland<sup>23)</sup>, have recognised the great interest which the association of Van der Noot with Spenser holds for the student of Spenser, and it is this aspect of the *Theatre* which is by far the most important. That Van der Noot and Spenser were acquainted with each other we may well believe, and the earlier Dutch biographers<sup>24)</sup> (see Grosart) of Van der Noot say so, but cite no authority. In this connection it is of interest to note that Henry Bynneman who was the printer of the *Theatre*, issued also a unique little volume of Spenser-Harvey correspondence in 1580. In the preface he refers to "Immerito" as one "in whome I knowe myselfe to be very good partes". Bynneman, who was also the printer of Gabriel Harvey's Latin works seems thus to have known the two friends and to form a link between them and Van der Noot and his *Theatre*. Again, Van der Noot enjoyed the patronage of Wm. Parr, Marquis of Northampton, and wrote a marriage song in honour of Blanca Gorges. We cannot but associate this with Spenser's friendship with Arthur Gorges and his wife, Douglas Howard, and the dedication of "Daphnaida" to the Marquesse of Northampton, widow of V. d. Noot's patron. She became, afterwards, the wife of Thomas Gorges

<sup>23)</sup> Revue de Littérature Comparée, Juil.-Sept. 1922. (I made acquaintance with this well-written article long after my own had been first written, but have made some use of it in subsequently revising my work.)

<sup>24)</sup> Huberts says: Van der Noot „had er den dichter Spencer tot vriend”.

who was uncle to Arthur Gorges, Raleigh's kinsman and Spenser's friend. Grosart's shrewd guess that Diggon Davie in the September eclogue of the *Sh. Cal.* is V. d. Noot, suggests another interesting link, which in the absence of absolute proof must remain probability only. What Dr. Johnson in disapproval called the "studied barbarity" of the diction may, as Grosart suggested, reflect the imperfect English of V. d. Noot; there is correspondence in phraseology between the eclogue and the *Theatre*, and much agreement in sentiment when Diggon speaks. The use of the word "home" is insufficient to make valid the objection that Diggon cannot be a Dutchman; besides V. d. Noot seems, from his epistle, to have regarded England definitely as his new home, while his return from the Catholic South to the Protestant North might very well also be poetically represented as a return "home".

But further evidence of a more definitely literary influence passing from V. d. Noot to Spenser is available. Galland, after a suggestive analysis of the characteristics of mind and of the art of these two poets, asks finally: "Faut-il imaginer . . . que Van der Noot . . . ait contribué à féconder le génie de Spenser?" We venture to answer in the affirmative. It will be necessary to consider V. d. Noot and his poetry for a brief space.<sup>25)</sup> Jonker van Van der Noot (or Noodt) 1539-1595, belonged to a leading Antwerp family. He enjoyed an excellent education and played a prominent part in the abortive Calvinistic rising of 1566-7 which resulted in his proscription and flight to England. Here, by Sept. 18, 1568, we learn that he had already sojourned some eighteen months, making, during that time, his debut as a poet with "*Het Eerste Bosken*" (published  $\pm$  1567, probably at Antwerp) a book which has a great deal of significance for Dutch literature. Shortly after came the *Theatre* and its translations published in London, where V. d. Noot, if we can believe the medical treatise, the "Governance", etc., to be his, seems to have practised quackery. In spite of his activities and the patronage of Wm. Parr, V. d. Noot left England soon after his English *Theatre* appeared. No reason for his departure has been discovered, but as we may gather from the September Eclogue he was probably disappointed in his expectations of recognition and reward, and hoped for more in France and Italy whither he migrated, visiting Ronsard at Paris and other French literati. In 1572 appeared his "*Poetische Werken*" of which the earliest extant edition is of 1580. We have further "*Das Buch Exstasis*" and the "*Olympiados*", a poetical digest of a big work on epic-allegorical lines, projected but never executed. He had now settled at Antwerp, setting up as the Ronsard of Brabant. And from the first he had been a pioneer with all the restless artistic activity, love for art, and enthusiasm for the French-Renaissance culture which animated the South of Holland. His "*Eerste Bosken*" throbs with the new spirit, and is strewn with Odes and Sonnets in the great Renaissance measure, the iambic. In the *Theatre* we have grouped some leading Renaissance names, Petrarch, Marot, Du Bellay, that may well have fascinated the young Spenser, as Koepel has said. But in it too we hear the thundering music and polemic of the religious movement that was shaking the Western world. And here again we have the significance of V. d. Noot for Northern European literature, viz. a combination of later 16th century classicism with the Germanic, Christian Romanticism of the Middle Ages, a combination developed to its greatest fruition in Spenser, Vondel and Milton. And V. d. Noot was, too, a professed

<sup>25)</sup> See *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*.

disciple of the Pléiade school, from whom, especially Marot, he has, like Spenser, many a translation and adaptation. He had all that belief in, and made triumphant assertion of the high mission of the poet, and his power of conferring immortality, that was shared by Sidney and Spenser and had found its way into England chiefly from France. As a true Pléiadist he cherished nationalistic aims. Love of his native land and his mother-tongue rings proudly through his work. Spenser's earnest: "For why a God's name may not we . . . have the kingdome of oure owne Language" and the metrical variety of the "*Shepherds Calendar*" that showed his "eagerness to explore the native capabilities of the language"<sup>26)</sup>, represent views and aims actually put into practice by V. d. Noot long before Spenser wrote independently. At that time when the French Renaissance was beginning to exert an influence which was reflected later by the "*Areopagus*", and which assisted so fundamentally in the building of the great literature of the English Renaissance, V. d. Noot was in reality an advance agent of those foreign literary interests that were steadily gaining a footing in England.<sup>27)</sup> Nor is this influence least reflected in Spenser, the writer of "*The English Poete*" and the October Eclogue, the close imitator of Desportes, Ronsard and Marot, e.g., in the Amoretti and the December Eclogue.<sup>28)</sup>

But besides the critical faculty; feeling for form, awakened artistic sense, and consciousness of means and ideals in poetry, so characteristic of the new movement, are also things which animated V. d. Noot, to whom the tribute of his younger contemporary Jacob v. Schuere, the miscellanist of the "*Nederduytzen Helicon*", 1610, as the introducer of Alexandrine and Iambic Pentameter is justly paid. New rhythms, new subjects and, above all, individuality of lyrical expression V. d. Noot, the Surrey of Dutch literature, helped to realise for Dutch poetry. For, let us make no mistake, V. d. Noot in spite of many lapses and artistic sins is a true poet and not an "Antwerp physician" (see *D. N. B.*). His ode to Marcus Von Wonsel, that to Von Carlo, and the finer strains of the "*Olympiados*" show him to be a poet and in the words of Vermeylen: "de eerste Nederlandsche Renaissance dichter", "een der schoonste verschijninghen onzer lyrik". Prinsen<sup>29)</sup> puts him (for Dutch poetry) in a class with Spenser, and Verwey<sup>30)</sup> has even more extravagant praise. But if, as Galland says: "il savait laisser parler son coeur en toute sincérité" in the lyrical vein, he was, "au fond" . . . "avant tout, un réaliste". He was associated, in fact, with that wonderful Dutch school of painter-poets, Lucas d'Heere, whose allegorical paintings were admired at Hampton Court, Cornelis Ketel, poet and portrait-painter to whom Elizabeth sat, Karel van Mander and others, whose fusion of poetry and painting so much enriched 16th and 17th century literature and may be paralleled in England with Blake and the Pre-Raphaelites whose expression likewise flowed over into pictorial mediums. Galland, sensible of the significance of this feature, has suggested that V. d. Noot "par son alliance étroite de la peinture et de la poésie" could have impressed upon Spenser this relation which was to be so magnificently realised in the "tableaux" of the *Faerie Queene*. If V. d. Noot's was the richly decorative type of mind

<sup>26)</sup> De Selincourt. *Introd. xiv. Sp. Poet. Works.*

<sup>27)</sup> a. *The French Renaissance in England*. S. Lee.  
b. *The French Influence in English Literature*. Upham.

<sup>28)</sup> *Mod. L. Rev.* Vol. 4. L. E. Kastner.

<sup>29)</sup> *Handboek*, p. 187.

<sup>30)</sup> Edition of V. d. Noot's poems.

that inevitably expresses itself in the seen figure rather than the concept, it was also the type that could not work without "tendenz", and that in giving us morals could not do so without stories, nor give us stories without morals, actions without reflections or reflection without illustrative action. In the *Theatre* (p. 12-13) we read: "And to sette the vanitie and inconstancie of worldly and transitorie thynges, the livelier before your eyes, I have broughte in here twentie sightes or vysions & caused them to be graven to the ende all men may see that with their eyes, whiche I go aboute to expresse by writing to the delight & pleasure of the eye and eares", for as Horace says:

"He that teacheth pleasantly and well  
Doth in eche poynt all others excell".

He was, in short, a professed allegorist of the "fleshly" school whose early association with Spenser, destined to become one of the great pictorial artists and allegorists of literature, is of the highest interest. In Spenser, as in V. d. Noot, neither of whom actually went over to painting, allegory was a habit of mind. History and story are mostly subsidiary. He who attempts to read the whole of the *Faerie Queene* for the story only is merely subjecting himself to an endurance test. The allegory, except for the wondrous verse melodies, is ever the main and vital thing. Spenser, coming into contact with a writer such as V. d. Noot has been described to be, at an age when his poetic ideals and aspirations were at once rapidly forming and most easily influenced, could only be expected to have felt greatly that formative influence which V. d. Noot exerted on him.

Grosart speaks of Spenser's being "quickened and fired by V. d. Noot" and considers that the *Faerie Queene* reflects some features of V. d. Noot's Olympiad. Spenser, at one time fired by his earlier enthusiasms, had ambitions, as we gather from Harvey's allusive letter on the point, to rival Petrarch in visionmaking as he hoped to "overgo" Ariosto in another genre. "I dare saye", Harvey agrees, "you wyll holde yourselfe reasonably wel satisfied if your Dreames be but as wel esteemed of in Englande as Petrarches Visions be in Italy". In the same letter he digresses to mention — at what instance provided in Spenser's letter one knows not — that he "heard once a Divine preferre *Saint Johns Revelation* before al the veriest mætaphysicall Visions . . . ". The *Dreames*, as Harvey says, were good enough to win Spenser a purse with promise of more. Prof. Fletcher has pointed to the influence of the *Theatre*. "In theme and genre a goodly number of the 'COMPLAINTS' actually grew out of the early translations". The *Visions of the Worlds Vanitie* are "manifestly suggested" by the visions from the *Theatre*; *The Ruines of Time* by the *Ruines of Rome*. The motif of Virgil's *Gnat* is the inverse of that of the *Visions of the World's Vanitie*. The *Muiopotmos* is in idea and form obviously related to Virgil's *Gnat*. Lines 265-282 of *The Teares of the Muses* clearly echo Sonnet X of the *Visions of Bellay*, (also Sonnet XII) as do stz. 4 and 5 of Bk. I, Cant. 4 F. Q., Sonnet II of the same. Again in F. Q. I, V, 49, there is allusion to the "Antique ruines of the Romaines fall". This tends not merely to swell Spenser's debt to Marot and Du Bellay, but to show his intimacy with the *Theatre* and a coincidence of interest with V. d. Noot so remarkable, that we must believe the elder poet to have pointed the way and the eager youth to have raptly followed (C.p. above). Nor has Galland (like others who have given the subject some attention) failed to notice: "Il n'en reste pas moins que le développement et la production du poète anglais présentent de curieuses analogies avec ceux de son aîné". Both couched allegory in the adventures of knights, wrote marriage songs, etc.

(see p. 349 loc. cit.) But there are more "curieuses analogies". The two chief themes of the *Theatre* are the vanity and "unstedfastnesse" of earthly things, and the moral and religious decadence of the times. A sense of these constituted V. d. Noot's genuine mood at the time of his escape, and are these not the themes that constantly recur in Spenser's work? The first irresistibly attracted him. It forms "one of the dominating philosophical struggles of Spenser's life"<sup>31)</sup>. In the *Theatre* he had toyed with it and become attracted; the *Complaints* are full of it, the mood shifting from ironical bitterness to the airy mockery of *Muiopotmos*. It plays in and out of the *Faerie Queene* and in the last fragment the poet comes to grips with it. But the note there is one of resignation rather than of triumph. Not satisfied with his quibbling sophism, he finds relief in the final utterance which prays for the coming of the eternal "Saboath". The poet has not solved the enigma and has not outgrown the mood expressed in 1591 by: "When I behold this tickle trustless state", etc. (Visions of Pet. VII) At the end his mood was consonant with, and his very situation as a hapless refugee strangely analogous to the experiences of his Dutch friend, V. d. Noot, more than thirty years before.

This theme of the mutability and the vanity of life is inextricably bound up with Spenser's most characteristic work, and particularly because it was expressive of a fundamental trait in him, it was a theme with which V. d. Noot could not have failed to impress him. The spirited homilies of the *Theatre* on "those worldly and transitorie riches", "the vanitie and inconstancie of worldly and transitorie thynges" etc., would not have fallen strangely on the ears of the struggling, sensitive undergraduate, nor sounded less strange to the disappointed exile in Ireland.

The religious theme such as we have it in the *Theatre* is even more prominent in Spenser. To begin with, Spenser's association with a refugee poet who, an eye-witness and a victim, had barely escaped the unspeakable tyranny in the Netherlands, must inevitably have made a lasting impression on the youth's mind. Indeed Spenser seems to have acted on a suggestion made by V. d. Noot in a brief angry passage: The *free preaching of the gospel* in the Netherlands induces the uneasy *Dragon* to bestir himself. "As for the Christians it is too well knowne how they are bled, therefore I leave of to speak any more of that matter not mistrusting but that it shall be declared at large of some diligent writer."<sup>32)</sup> This hope, like Harvey's, that some of the "gallant wits" and "brave pennes" of his day would adequately magnify the exploits of Essex — at least partly fulfilled by Spenser's portraiture of Calidore — seems to have been realised in Cantos X-XI, Bk. V, F.Q., and especially in Arthur's fight with the monster (inquisition) under the altar. We recall how this monster was astounded by Arthur's "blazing shield" as Orgoglio was dazzled before. This part of the allegory has been understood as referring to the power of the free dissemination of religious truth and light or the "open bible"<sup>33)</sup>. The power of the preaching of the gospel is also touched on in the incident of the squire's bugle. (F.Q. Bk. I, Canto VIII, 3-5.) Imagery of a similar kind are the "Shield of Faith" etc., of the Red Cross Knight (see Raleigh letter and F.Q. Bk. I).

<sup>31)</sup> Cory, p. 181.

<sup>32)</sup> V. d. Noot seems to have turned proselyte afterwards, a step quite possibly due to a genuine change of opinion in favour of the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>33)</sup> I think that Arthur's shield is better interpreted to signify a "Shield of Faith" of greater resplendence than St. George's.

V. d. Noot uses this familiar biblical imagery and enlarges on the same themes. The publishing and preaching of God's Word" will finally deliver men from Rome, and goodness will reign "whenas all these abhominations shall cease and be gone by the meanes of the preaching of the gospel". V. d. Noot's use of "take unto you therefore the whole armour of God" (p. 101, etc.) (c.p. Ephesians 6, 17.) probably suggested to Spenser the fine use to which he put this.

Some features of Duessa and her Beast are taken from the *Theatre*.<sup>34)</sup> "This woman did afar off seeme to be honest and vertuous but indeede she was farre otherwise." "She is known well enough by her naughty fruities of such as are skylful of godly knowledge and have also the spirit of understanding" (C. p. Arthur and Duessa, F. Q. Bk. I). "She is nothing else but an unshamefaste and pestyferous whore" (referred to later as "Spiritual whoredom"). "But this judgment is hidden from infidels the whyche are so bewitched and inchaunted by the meanes of theyr fayre outward shewe . . . that whatsoeuer she doth, speaketh . . . they make much of, worship and embrace it as holy, honest and perfect good." (C. p. F. Q. Bk. I, the "paynim" knights Sansioy, Sansloy, Sansfoy). "Moreover not only these . . . but also an infinite number even of the elect and chosen of God have been entangled, yea and have given credite to their false lies and errorees" — c. p. the deception of the R. C. knight. "And I saw that she was the married wife of the devil" (C. p. Duessa, mistress of Orgoglio). The bloodguiltiness of the witch is much emphasised. C. p. Apocalyptic sonnet "The blood of martyrs dere were hir delite". The beast is described as "whole of colour of scarlet, reddish in token of greate tyrannie, sheddynge of blood and murthers" of "those which will not agree to their wicked and divelish institutions".

Much correspondence with F. Q. Bk. I, VIII, 6- , makes this part of the *Theatre* commentary sound like a prose interpretation of this memorable canto. Duessa's "manyheaded", "purple" beast is "bloudie mouthed with late cruell feast" and "swolne with bloud of late" and like the "ugly beast" of the first apocal. sonnet has one of its heads "still freshly bleeding of a grievous wound", which V. d. Noot explains as referring to the successful inroads that have been made on the Romish Church. C. p. Revel. XIII, etc. The cup is "hir false and cursed religion which she daily communicateth distributed about the Chalice. It contained all kynde of false and develish doctrine, all kinde of errorees lyes and beastlinesse, all manner of craftie works of hypocrites", etc. C. p. Archimago (hypocrisy) in close alliance with Duessa and stz. 14, F. Q. "Then took the angrie witch her golden cup . . . replete with magic artes" etc. Of the woman, V. d. Noot says finally: "outwardly she seemeth to be gilded", "at length she shall be left whole naked". "They shall strip her naked that so many as beholde hir, may cry out upon hir and detest hir". C. p. the stripping of Duessa (Canto VIII, stz. 46-50) and the exposing of the false Florimel, another "forged beauty" (C. p. Revel. 17; 16).

The idolatry practised by the satyrs (F. Q. I. VI. 19) and the figures Corceca "blind devotion" and her daughter Abessa recall passages in the *Theatre* such as: "Theyr church which standeth in nothing else than in

<sup>34)</sup> Fletcher also noticed this as showing, too, that Spenser did recognise and use V. d. Noot's apocalyptic sonnets even if he excluded them from the "Complaints", with which they are not in harmony. Also, being compositions of V. d. Noot they were naturally not as freely at the disposal of Spenser as the other poems. C. p. further the last Apocalyptic sonnet (on the "holy citie") with F. Q. Bk. I. Canto X. 55-59.

outward false shew of many gay, trifling and vain hypocritical ceremonies. They say they preach the scripture but... it is but the bare letter and the onely name". They "trust in their own works and deservings as masses"... "so many paternosters and Ave Marias and a hundred more such dreams".

The "Water of lyfe" so called "because it maketh whole and giveth salvation to our soules", can "satisfy" "comfort" and "make whole and healthful"; and the "Tree of Life" that are discussed in the commentary recall F. Q. Bk. I, XI, 29-34 and 46-52. On page 38 of the *Theatre* we read: "They sing and make ballettes, they compose in metre and set forth books of great slauders, blasphemies and lyes against God, his Christe and his Church . . . They rage and fume, they are woode like blood-thyrstie tyrants that gnash as fierce as cruel lyons". This makes the bay of the Blatant Beast resound in our ears once more and recalls the gibbeting of Malfont as a type of the scurrilous and libellous poet. There are few subjects which made a deeper impression on Spenser than the prevalence of slander and detraction and V. d. Noot may well have helped to bring home to him its danger as a socially destructive force. The subject of slander is raised in Bk. I and broadening out as the poem proceeds, is given full treatment in Bk. 6 both as a pernicious personal vice, and a terrible subversive force in religion and society generally.

Van der Noot and Spenser are temperamentally and spiritually akin. Zeal for reform, satire arising mostly from a keen sense of the abuses of the time and ranging from gentle pessimism to angry outburst are characteristic of both. And this temper, united with moral seriousness, inevitably disturbed that spiritual balance often described as a sense of humour, which both men lacked. Both were fervent idealists upon whom the sadly different actual imposed an acute martyrdom from which a refreshing Platonism provided constant means of escape. The spirit of Spenser's two hymns of "Beautie" pervades V. d. Noot's work. On a day, sings he, Mercury appeared to me,

"En toonde my oock med syn Caducée  
Uut gunsten groot het schoon beeldt en d'Idée  
Van de reyn maeghdt . . ."

Thus, with a platonic vision, also reminiscent of the *Theatre* whose manner is as conspicuous in the visions of the *Faerie Queene* as in those of the *Olympiados*, opens this "chef d'œuvre" of V. d. Noot, with a translation into French by himself. It reveals the curious mixture of elements which is such a striking feature of the *Faerie Queene*, but much more imperfectly fused than in the later work. In the *Olympiados* as in V. d. Noot himself, are mixed: "le moyen âge et les temps modernes, la Renaissance et la Réforme, le goût de l'art et le désir de la beauté morale, l'amour et l'amour-propre", but "il était réservé à un plus grand artiste que lui, à cet Edmund Spenser, qui très probablement feuilleta le *Théâtre* et l'*Olympiade*, de réaliser cette synthèse harmonieuse d'éléments divers à laquelle V. d. Noot ne parvint pas". In Spenser, "comme en V. d. Noot, s'unissent la Réforme et la Renaissance, le zèle moral et l'amour du beau, mais sur un plan supérieur de la création poétique". But the resemblance is more particular than these words of Galland (p. 348-9) would show. Professedly an epic, but really a moral and social allegory, the poem is based on the journey of a hero to a consummation, viz: the realization of the divine idea of beauty, goodness and poesy, represented by Olympia, a platonic love whom the poet never ceased to cherish. The hero, like St. George, strives to attain

the highest good and journeys through manifold trials and temptations to the demesne of the ineffable *Olympia*. His most persistent enemies are Kosmica (worldliness) a "giftige falsche en ungetrewe creature", and Hedone (fleshy lust). Among much that has a remarkable correspondence with certain features of the *Faerie Queene* are the following:

The knight comes to *Euclia* (wereldeere-worldly honours) and her palace *high on a hill*. The building is beautiful and allures *many frequenter* ("menigh man compt hier binnen"), but behind is a secret, pestilential cave ("vuil gat") where the foolish inmates are secretly dispatched. Warned by his good guides our hero escapes. We cannot but parallel *Lucifera* and her *House of Pride* "mounted full hie on a sandie hill". "Great troupes of people travelled thitherward" and the *House* itself is described in terms of Sonnet II of the "Bellay" series. There is too the "concealed dungeon deepe" at the back "that few could spie". In this "Dongeon mercilesse" are "strowne the antique ruines of the Romaines fall" a reference which seems to show that Spenser, when he wrote this canto, had in mind Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome* and the *Theatre* poems, that were probably being used at that time for the poems of which some were later to appear in the *Complaints*. Finally as the Olympiad hero is warned by his good guides, so the dwarf warns his master to make a timely departure (C. p. F. Q. Bk. I, Canto IV. 1-16, etc. and Canto V, 45-53). But more like Sir Guyon this time, he falters and is drawn into the palace of Pluto who prevails on him to stay and tempts him. He, however, resists the blandishments of Pluto and his daughters Chrysea (gold) and Argyrea (silver) and with a supreme effort of self-control joins his patiently waiting guides. We recall how Guyon resists temptation in Mammon's cave hard by the abode of Pluto, refusing Mammon's offer of his daughter Philotime's hand, for riches bring enslavement and unrest. Most men spend their time "in unquietnesse to the service of wicked Mammon and other unlawful and greedie desires of earthly and transitorie riches, losing and forgoing thereby the joy and quietness of the spirit and conscience and most of all true Christian liberty" says V. d. Noot in the *Theatre*. Guyon endorses these views, saying, "with such vaine shows thy Worldlings vile abuse" and scorns to be the "servile sclave" of riches, deeming them the "roote of all disquietness" leading to "outrageous wrong and hellish covetize".

The Olympiad hero comes to the "Temple of Love" where Venus and Olympia appear, but she is not his yet, for Venus prescribes some further course of discipline. In the garden with its trees, many singing birds, trellises, flowers, etc., he watches Cupid shooting arrows accompanied by his "menye", and at last leaving in the company of good nymphs, among whom are Faith, Hope and Charity, he bids Venus adieu. We recall Scudamor's visit to the "Temple of Venus" and its description in F. Q. IV, X, 37- ; The Masque of Cupid, Bk. III, the "Garden of Adonis" III, VI; and several other beautiful pictures such as Bk. VII, VII, 39- , Bk. III, V, 39- , etc., that remind us at the same time of epigrams 3 and 4 and Sonet 12 in the *Theatre*.

We must remember that the poem is a mere framework ("Cort Begryp") of a greater one V. d. Noot was planning. Ideas and situations are therefore barely mentioned or but lightly sketched in. Still they suggest infinite possibilities to the fertile invention, as Spenser, it would seem, appreciated to the full, and even as the work stands it impresses one with its earnest idealism, pageantry and luscious visions.

As early as 1571, V. d. Noot had commenced upon it. There is a preface

which explains the allegory by means of a conversation between three friends. (C.p. Spenser's use of dialogue in the "Vueue" and the Raleigh letter). The grand plan of twelve books is divulged. Reference is made to Ronsard's project of a *Fransiade* in XII books of which only four had appeared, etc., and altogether V. d. Noot seems to have been as anxious to point to established precedent as Spenser was to be. The poem appeared when Spenser was contemplating his great work and in those times of close relations between England and the Netherlands, especially in the book trade, would easily have come into Spenser's hands if V. d. Noot had not personally acquainted him with it.

The *Olympiados* bears traces of "Rose" influence, but Vermeylen considers it to have been more influenced by Dante and his French imitators. In fact V. d. Noot as a typical Renaissance religious poet delved in the common mine of Renaissance subject matter. The association of V. d. Noot and Spenser is therefore not merely a question of personal but of international literary relations. It is a remarkable manifestation of the time spirit which spreading over national boundaries, invests European culture with that cosmopolitanism in art which has made possible the heights of self-expression to which the European has attained. The vast amount of literary commonplace at all times, makes the study of influences interesting, but tangled, especially in respect of the 16th century. Marot, Ronsard and Du Bellay, e.g., each have a Temple of Cupid, besides V. d. Noot and Spenser and the rest. The *Faerie Queene* is a veritable repository of well-worn themes. On this account, Koepel will not believe that Spenser made use of the apocalyptic sonnets. This subject is common to the Reformation literature of the time an taken direct from the Bible.

For the idea in Sonet 10 (1569):

"It seemed that arte and nature strived to ioyne" etc.

an idea of which Spenser was greatly enamoured, playing with it in F. Q. IV, X, 21; VI, X, 5; III, VI, 44; II, XII, 58-9, commentators usually refer us to Tasso, but we may as readily ascribe it to echoes of the *Theatre* verses of which there is many an iteration, showing Spenser's familiarity with the *Theatre*. Jusserand wishing to stress Spenser's debt to Marot, points to an expression that Spenser repeated four times in his later work:

"That sweetely in accorde did tune their voyce (epigram 4)  
Unto the gentle sounding of the waters fall."

but du Bellay (Sonet 8) also has:

"Did tune her plaint to falling rivers sound".

Marot's: "Las! rien ne dire au monde que tristesse" (epigr. 6), or Du Bellay's: "Las rien ne dure au monde que torment" is often re-echoed later. The line in epigram 6:

"As snowe and golde together had bene wrought"

reminds us of F. Q. III, VIII, 6, and of some stanzas in the "Hymne in Honour of Beautie" (which should be read in close connection with the story of the Florimels).

But time spirit is not the tyranny of uniformity and cannot be allowed to explain adequately the identity of interests, tastes and artistic means adopted in Van der Noot and Spenser. Besides knowledge and use of the *Theatre* and the *Olympiad*, a personal association with their author — and an association that must surely pass as unique in English literature at least — would make their influence upon a poet so sensitive and receptive as Spenser, much greater than a mere citation of parallels could show. I have no hesitation therefore in pronouncing Van der Noot and his work of

interest and importance for students of Spenser who wish to know the full facts when appraising his workmanship and genius, and tracing its development.

It was his regular habit to sacrifice no material he could possibly make use of. The *Faerie Queene* alone holds an abundance of matter which the poet "must have gathered here and there wherever he found it" as Miss H. Sandison expresses it. Spenser, far from confusing originality with novelty, was an inveterate borrower, but an artist immeasurably superior to V. d. Noot, and indeed one of the great alchemists of literature; although it is customary to consider that he lacked constructive ability — a lack that becomes less apparent upon every successive reading of the *Faerie Queene*.

W. J. B. PIENAAR.

## Notes and News.

**The Teaching of Modern Languages in Holland.** In the issue of December, 1925, of *Modern Languages*, the official organ of the English *Modern Language Association*, there appeared an article by Miss M. G. Devonshire on "The Teaching of Modern Languages in Norway, Denmark and Holland". The author was granted leave of absence by the L.C.C., we are informed, in order to study methods of language teaching in the capitals of North-Western Europe. Her investigation was spread over a period of three months, and was conducted in, among other cities, Oslo, Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Brussels and Paris. In her own words, she has "been able to obtain a valuable insight into the systems and methods of teaching languages in vogue there." The article is a brief summary of a report in which the results of her investigations are embodied.

As regards Scandinavia, it appears that a pupil who has attended the Middle School and thence proceeded to the modern side of the Gymnasium has been taught English during 35 hours weekly spread over six consecutive years in Norway, and during 30 hours weekly in seven years in Denmark. Compared with the hours allotted to English in Holland, these are remarkable figures. We are told that in Scandinavia the Direct Method is universally followed, and that no teacher there would think of teaching by any other. Either English or German is taken as the first language.

The second part of the article deals with Holland. "Though good linguists by repute, the Dutch have an organisation and methods quite different from those employed in Scandinavia". This statement, whatever its implication, may well arouse the Dutch reader's curiosity for what follows. When he has finished, he will probably wonder where Miss Devonshire got her information. Truth and error are distributed in about equal proportion over the page and a half devoted to this country.

Besides being inaccurate, Miss Devonshire's summary gives a one-sided impression of the Dutch system, seeing that she visited Amsterdam only to the exclusion of the rest of Holland, and that the inserted time-tables are those of a "Higher Burgher School", three years' course, and of the classical side of the Amsterdam Lyceum. As every one in Holland knows, these two types comprise but a small number of schools, the former being practically confined to Amsterdam. Of the far more numerous H. B. Schools with a five years' course, and of the Gymnasia, no time-tables are given; of the former it is wrongly stated that each modern language has three or four lessons a week in the last two years, which should, of course, be two, except for the

"economic" sides recently set up in many schools of the type, which are nowhere mentioned in the article. The five years' course, Miss Devonshire writes, does not at present lead to the University. As a matter of fact, it gives admittance to two of the five faculties, those of Science and Medicine. This also disposes of her statement that the classical Gymnasium alone prepares for the University; while it should not have been omitted that a 'Staatsexamen' in Latin and Greek enables pupils of the H. B. S. with a five years' course to enter any other faculty than the two to which they are *ipso facto* entitled.

It is further stated that French in primary schools has been stopped "for political reasons", a phrase misleading by its vagueness; besides, the abolition is not by any means complete. In the Gymnasium languages are not *usually* but *invariably* begun in the order mentioned. Many of our readers will be surprised to hear that "the Direct Method is practically unknown in Holland." Again, where did Miss Devonshire get her information? The truth is that no method, whether the direct or any other, is "universally followed" as in Scandinavia; the teacher is free to form his own method, within the frame of the regulations. Those employing the Direct Method very strictly are probably a minority, but to say that it is practically unknown is misleading. Dangerously vague again is the statement that "though the teachers are acquainted with the principles of Phonetics, these have no place in the class-room". If this is meant to imply that, contrary to Scandinavian method, phonetic script is not used, the statement is erroneous. — The article fittingly concludes with another mistake: "In secondary schools no class is allowed to comprise more than twenty-four pupils." This was true up to about three years ago; at present the limit is *thirty* for the first, second and third years, *twenty-six* for the fourth and fifth.

We have pointed out these mistakes in Miss Devonshire's report to prevent, if possible, erroneous notions about the teaching of modern languages in Holland from spreading abroad. We will conclude with a summary of her article in the March number of *Les Langues Modernes*; it is an instructive object-lesson on the formation of myths:

*Hollande*: C'est le français qui demeure la langue principale (12 heures pour les trois années d'enseignement du second degré), puis vient l'allemand avec 10 heures et l'anglais avec 8 heures pour les deux dernières années seulement. La méthode directe est à peu près inconnue, on pratique beaucoup la traduction, version et thème, l'enseignement de la grammaire est très poussé; pas de phonétique (mais les maîtres la connaissent), pas de composition libre aux examens. Aucune classe ne comprend plus de vingt-quatre élèves. Heureux pays!

---

**Universiteit van Amsterdam.** De Fakulteit der Letteren en Wijsbegeerte van de Universiteit van Amsterdam heeft de volgende prijsvraag uitgeschreven, te beantwoorden door studerenden aan een Nederlandse instelling van hoger onderwijs:

*De fakulteit verlangt een kritiese bespreking van de pogingen die gedaan zijn om te bewijzen dat Defoe, toen hij Robinson Crusoe schreef, onder buitenlandse invloed heeft gestaan.*

De vraag moet worden beantwoord in de taal waarin zij is gesteld.

De antwoorden moeten, met een andere hand dan die des vervaardigers of met de schrijfmachine geschreven, vóór of op 1 Mei 1927 worden toegezonden aan de sekretaris van de Senaat der Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Zij moeten getekend zijn met een kenspreuk en daarbij moet gevoegd worden een verzegeld briefje, dat dezelfde kenspreuk tot opschrift heeft en de naam, het studievak en het adres des schrijvers bevat.

Op de derde Maandag van de maand September 1927 wordt het oordeel der fakulteit over de ingekomen verhandelingen in het openbaar medegelezen en aan de schrijver van het meest voldoende antwoord, dat door de fakulteit de eer der bekroning is waardig gekeurd, de gouden erepenning uitgereikt.

(N. R. C.)

## Reviews.

*Altfriesisches Wörterbuch* von DR. F. HOLTHAUSEN. (Germanische Bibliothek, herausgegeben von Wilhelm Streitberg †, I. Abt., IV. Reihe: Wörterbücher, 5). XVIII + 152 pp. Heidelberg, 1925.

It has become a commonplace statement that Old Frisian is the "step-child" among Germanic dialects. In Holland, the country one would expect to be leading in Frisian studies, every linguistic interest seems to have vanished since Van Helten's and Buitenrust Hettema's days. The so-called 'Young Frisian Movement' for the present is of greater importance for literature or nationalistic feelings than for philologic research. In Germany, the eminent Theodor Siebs, well versed both in Old Frisian and Modern Frisian dialects, has not been in a position for many years to continue the great work embodied in his *Geschichte der friesischen Sprache*.

Owing to this state of matters any publication on Old Frisian is a welcome event. So the little circle interested in Frisian language is beforehand kindly disposed towards the Old Frisian Dictionary of Prof. Holthausen, whose more than stepmotherly sympathy with Frisian has clearly come to light of late in several articles published especially in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*.

At first on looking over the pages one feels somewhat disappointed. An Old Frisian dictionary of 152 pages, small 8°, giving the words in only one form, without a single quotation or even reference! The orthography of Old Frisian texts, indeed, varies ad infinitum. And anyone who knows from experience, how difficult it frequently is to state the exact meaning of many terms, often legal ones, is inclined to be suspicious of Prof. Holthausen's manner of defining them simply by means of a few synonyms, separated by a comma, the more distant meanings by a semicolon.

The reason of all this, no doubt, is the trifling interest paid to Old Frisian by Germanic philologists. This sort of publications usually do not meet with a ready market: the publisher, therefore, will have insisted on limitation. Even as it is, the book could not be published without the support of learned societies.

What sort of readers, then, does Prof. Holthausen intend his dictionary for? In the 'Vorwort' he expresses himself very modestly. The book serves 'um zunächst mir und vielleicht auch anderen eine Grundlage für weitere Studien zu schaffen.' We are, of course, chiefly interested in those 'others'. From the words 'Grundlage für weitere Forschung' we might conclude that Prof. H. has in mind scholars occupying themselves with Frisian studies specially. Such scholars will be conscious of the hard work the author must have bestowed on this little book. However, they cannot but feel

keenly the want of references. Therefore, they will never be able to do without Richthofen's *Wörterbuch* and Van Helten's *Lexicologie*.

On the other hand, this dictionary seems to be an excellent guide to scholars who want to read the Frisian texts from a historical point of view.

Another category of readers, too, Prof. Holthausen seems to have had in view, viz. Germanic, specially English philologists who, engaged in lexicological or phonological researches, wish to look up in the dictionary whether some word or cognates occur in Frisian, or to verify quotations they find in other people's papers. Though this group is not mentioned in the 'Vorwort', a summary of 'die Laute des Altfriesischen im Verhältnis zum Westgermanischen' shows, it seems to me, that the author has been thinking of such readers. I suppose, indeed, the book will find its way in these circles, being well fitted for such a purpose.

In this periodical it is natural to look upon the book from the point of view of this category of users. The conciseness, certainly, will not trouble them. From the 'Vorwort' they learn that Holthausen gives the words in a normalized East Frisian form. In many cases, moreover, variations in spelling (or sound) are indicated, e. g. by writing *å* the *a* alternating with *e* as in *låmelsa*, and by using the sign *å* for *a* alternating with *o* as in *lång*. Further, in words that cannot be joined under one heading in such a way, the reader is often helped by cross-references.

Another difficulty lies in vowel-quantity. We often observe that originally long vowels have been shortened in Modern Frisian dialects, whilst Old Frisian texts do not give any indication whether these shortenings are old. There are also vowel-lengthenings which are looked upon by Siebs as going back to the time before the manuscripts. Prof. Holthausen indicates old etymological length only, nor does he project the shortenings above-mentioned back to Old Frisian, to judge from his saying (p. VI): 'Wie weit Kürzungen vor Konsonantengruppen, wie sie die modernen Dialekte vielfach zeigen, schon alt sind, wird sich schwerlich im einzelnen mit Sicherheit entscheiden lassen.' In the summary of sound correspondences he departs from this principle, quoting *askia* (O. E. *āscian*) with short vowel, where as the word in the glossary itself has a long vowel, as we should expect. Another inconsistency, in the glossary, is in the short vowel of *fest* (O. E. *fýst*) 'Faust', as far as I can see. Further, I cannot perceive the rule Prof. Holthausen follows in his treatment of the suffix *-lik* (Goth. *-leiks*). Generally, it has a short vowel, as in *érlik* 'ehrbar,-lich', *epplik* 'öffentlich', *endlik* 'endlich, schlieslich'. When the vowel is given long in *mis-lík* 'ungleich, verschieden', one might admit that in this compound *-lik* has its full meaning and is not yet weakened to a suffix. In the case of *frílik* 'frei' quantity is not so easy to understand, and hardly in that of *friöndlík* 'freundlich'.

This dictionary has a peculiarity we are familiar with e. g. from Holthausen's glossary to Beowulf, viz. the author joins together under one heading compounds or derivations from one stem, and omits in the following words the common element, indicating this by ~. So *fiuchta* 'fechten, streiten' and under it the compounds *bi ~*, *on ~*, *to ~*; *flask*<sup>1)</sup> 'Fleisch' with *~ houwere* 'Fleischhauer' and *~ lik* 'fleischlich'. — I shall not contest the advantages of an arrangement based on etymological considerations, especially when looking-up is facilitated by references to the head-word. I do not think, however, the space saved by the ~ counterbalances the

<sup>1)</sup> Here again Holthausen admits shortening of *å* < *ai* before consonant-group, cf. above.

drawbacks connected with it. So we find *åmbecht*, *åmb(e)t* n. 'Amt, Amts-' etc., and under that word  $\sim$  *ich* 'amtlich'. It would be dangerous to quote the latter word going by H.'s data only: even by making all possible combinations, one does not get the only form which this  $\alpha\pi\alpha\xi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\omega$ , as a matter of fact, has in the texts: *ambachtich*. In the same way we might construct a word \**hiretēken* 'Heerzeichen' which occurs as *heerteken* in Richthofen, though, theoretically, *hiretēken* is quite possible. I will, then, not go so far as to suppose somebody might make up from  $\sim$  *inge* 'Verheerung' a word \**hire-ingē* (also to be found under *here*, *hire*).

A worse thing is to be seen on the very first page. There the word *ā, ē* 'Wasser, Flusz' serves as a typus for no less than five other *a*'s that have nothing but orthography in common with the leading one. Even quantity is not always the same. Furthermore, a reader who is not well acquainted with Frisian cannot decide whether the interchange of *a* and *e* occurs in all the words linked up to *ā, ē* 1. by that  $\sim$ . Here we can hardly speak of an etymological arrangement, rather of a merely accidental one.<sup>1)</sup>

The number of such examples might be increased. But enough have been mentioned to show that this manner of notation is of little use in saving space, and causes serious difficulties to the reader.

I have mentioned the summary of sound correspondences at the beginning. In the series of Old Frisian consonants *th* is lacking. This is of all the more weight because the unsuspecting reader might conclude from a remark under *d* (which is said to represent 'stimmhaft gewordenem *th* in späteren Denkmälern') that in elder texts *th* has the value of *p* only, not of *ð*.

Even concerning *h* some more details would have been desirable. In the list of correspondences nothing is said about *h*. In the glossary the words beginning with *hl-*, *hr-*, *hw-*, *hn-* are quoted exclusively in their full form. Consequently, the only place where the reader is informed of the existence of *h*-less forms, is a note at the bottom of p. VII. There the author says that his principle of giving the normalized East Frisian form entails 'Setzung des *h* vor Konsonant'. A short reference in the glossary under *r, l, w* and *n* would not have been superfluous, e. g. '*r-* s. *hr-*'.

Etymological relations (from other Germanic dialects) are given 'as briefly as possible', the author informs us p. VI. In many cases he cannot give any, because everything is hypothetical, or no attempt at etymologizing the word has been made at all. We cannot but praise the author for mentioning only what may be looked upon as sure. Where he cites Dutch words, he does not consider the difference between Modern, Earlier or Middle Dutch and that between Standard and Dialect so punctually as we Dutch are wont to: so one is surprised to see words like *vaken* 'oft' (s. v. *faken*), *deurpel* 'Schwelle' (s. v. *dreppel*), *lak* 'Nachteil' (s. v. *lek*) qualified as 'niederländisch' simply.

Finally, I have to speak about the purely lexicological contents of the book, the most important part after all. Generally speaking, the author has succeeded, within the narrow limits he was obliged to draw, in grouping the principal meanings in quite a surveyable manner, making a sensible use of Von Richthofen's and, especially, Van Helten's researches, not to mention other commentators. As a matter of course, the many questionable

<sup>1)</sup> So it is quite comic to see the word *fest* 'Faust' above-mentioned being followed by  $\sim$  2. 'Adj. *fest*'. A fantastic reader might be tempted to find etymological relations between the two words: the semasiological bridge could be laid with no more acrobacy than is often observed in etymological speculations.

points are least satisfactory: here we should have liked to see Prof. Holthausen's choice or proposal somewhat illustrated or discussed. Likewise the frequent polysema (*stånda, falla, rēda* etc.), where one would like to have a convincing quotation, especially for the uncommon meanings.

Not the least merit of Prof. Holthausen's book is that he has undertaken the laborious work of excerpting and interpreting *Jus municipale, Jurisprudentia frisica* and some other documents which Von Richthofen did not use sufficiently if at all. A laborious work indeed, as we have not even so much as appropriate editions. The correctness of his explanations cannot be estimated by one who has not perused these texts in the same way. My experience not going further than Richthofen's texts, I abstain from criticism. From Prof. Holthausen's previous publications on the subject of Old Frisian, however, we know his thoroughness and the carefulness of his interpretations. So we have every reason to rely on this glossary, too.

Printer's errors are very rare. I met with one, easy to rectify, under *wlite*. O. Sax. *wlili*, there quoted in comparison, should be read *wliti*. Perhaps among the inconsistencies in vowel quantity I mentioned above, there are also some typographical errors. Would the short vowel of *klam* 'falsche Beschuldigung' where we are referred to *klēm*, have to be counted here?

My remarks on the glossary proper for the greater part concern externals, which do not detract from its intrinsic value. Still, this Old Frisian Dictionary is only a provisional one. The author himself does not look upon his work as something final. It is rather a public demonstration of the deplorable condition of Frisian studies. Let us hope Holthausen's book will draw the attention of a few more Germanic philologists to this difficult and for that very reason promising field of studies.

The Hague.

C. B. VAN HAERINGEN.

---

*The Comparison of Inequality. The Semantics and Syntax of the Comparative Particle in English.* By G. W. SMALL. Pp. ix + 173. Baltimore, 1923.

This interesting and suggestive work, a doctoral thesis, submitted to the board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, contains an elaborate exposition of the development of the comparative construction in the various Indo-European languages in general and that of the particle-construction in English in particular. The author considers it an important part of his problem to 'arrive at an understanding of the elements of meaning that underlie the comparison of inequality in English, as expressed by the particle *than*'. These elements are in his opinion the *temporal* and the *adversative*.

In the oldest periods of the I. E. languages there were two means of expressing the comparative of inequality, occurring side by side; namely by a *clause* and by a *case-construction* (the *ablative*, generally considered to be the original case of comparison, the *genitive*, or in Germanic the *dative*). The author objects to the conception that the particle-construction developed out of the case-form, a view held by Ziemer, Delbrück, Schwab and others. Though the question as to which of the two is the original, cannot be decided with any degree of certainty, he considers the particle-construction as more elementary. The case-form presupposes already a system of comparative endings, which is a relatively late development. Moreover the use of the case-form was restricted to those instances where the two objects

compared were either in the nominative or in the accusative and both governed the same verb. The construction with the particle, on the other hand, had a much wider application, comprising all possible relations, also such as :

He is much stronger than before, or  
The deer runs faster than it seems. (p. 20),

which could not possibly be expressed by a case-form.

The first chapter gives a survey of the Indo-European system of comparison. In all the comparative constructions, in those with particles as well as those expressed by means of case-forms and prepositions, two elements have been traced by previous investigators, even in the earliest records, 'the *adversative* idea (or *separative*) and the idea of bringing together (*sociative*)' (p. 15) . . . . 'This apparent contradiction means merely that the two objects are brought together in the mind so that the contrast, or the difference may be pointed out' (p. 17).

The most elementary way of expressing comparison was by assigning a quality to one object and denying it to the other. This was done by using a paratactical construction, containing a negation, of the following type: 'A is great, B is not great'. The writer quotes examples of this use of the negation in Sanskrit and Greek and of its pleonastic use in modern languages :

. . . . *raþre þanne he ne wene* (Ayenb. 179)  
Il est plus puissant que vous ne croyez. (p. 16).

In this very rise of the comparative clause from the asyndetic parataxis he sees the explanation of the great variety of particles, to express the comparative relation. They have been divided into *separative* or *adversative* particles: Goth. *þan*, Eng. *nor* (common in the dialects of Scotland and of North England: Better be happy nor wise. N. E. D. *nor* conj.<sup>2</sup>) and *but* (N. E. D. *but*, C, I, 5.), and those that are truly comparative, the *syntactical* particles (Lat. *quam*, O. E. *þonne*, mod. E. *than*, mod. H. G. *als*, *denn*, *wie*).

In the second and third chapters Mr. Small discusses in detail the two elements that, according to him, underlie the English comparative particle: its temporal nature and the adversative element.

The particle *than* (Germanic \**þan*, O. E. *þonne*, *þonne*) was originally a demonstrative adverb which later on assumed a relative function: The man is taller than the boy is = The man is tall, then the boy is tall. Just as all subordinate clauses the clause of comparison goes back to a coordinate clause and probably in its earlier stage of development to a paratactical construction of the following form :

He is taller; you are tall [contrast]  
He is tall; you are not (tall) [opposition.]

In modern languages the particle has lost its temporal nature, has become entirely notional and is consequently unstressed. The form of the adjective prepares the hearer or reader for the comparative relation before the clause follows. The comparative construction is therefore an emphatic expression, as the author proves by adducing examples from various languages where the particle is used after the positive degree: L. Lat.: *bonum est confidere in Domino quam confidere in homine*. (Ps. 117, 8).

O. E.: God ys on dryhten georne to þenceanne þonne on mannan wese mod to treowianne.

Other grammarians have tried to solve the problem how the Germ. \**þan*, which was originally temporal in meaning, could come to express the

adversative relation of the comparative construction. Mr. Small deals with their several views on pp. 78 ff. He thinks, however, that they have all overlooked the fact that the adversative force was inherent in the particle from the earliest times. It is apparent from the use of the Gothic adverb and conjunction *þan*, which has temporal as well as adversative connotations.

Temporal: *jah þan andhaita im þatei ni hwanhun kunja izwis* (Mat. 7,23).

Adversative: *bidjandansuþ þan ni filuwaurdjaiþ*, *swaswe þai piudo*, (Mat. 6, 7). It is, however, never used as a comparative particle, the strictly disjunctive *þau* being used in its stead. The writer quotes examples of a similar use of Old Saxon *than* (pp. 106, 107). After asserting that in English the adversative element in the particle *þonne* 'is not prominent outside the comparative construction' he adduces two cases from the Lindisfarne Gospels, where *þonne* has an adversative connotation. 'This meaning of *þonne* has been generally overlooked; Grein and Bosworth do not mention it,' he says (p. 108). This is not correct, for Bosworth gives many more instances of the same use under *þanne* IV. Wülfing, Syntax Alf., II, 684, mentions *þonne* under the 'entgegenstellende (not gegensätzliche, as Small says) Konjunktionen' without giving examples of its use.

Mr. Small also attributes adversative force to *then* in: He is then a giant to an ape; but *then* is an ape a doctor to such a man (Shak., Much Ado; V, 1, 201) and: 'There was some difficulty in keeping all things in order, but *then* Vivian Grey was such an excellent manager, and *then* with infinite tact..... (Disraeli, Vivian Grey, I, IV) These two sentences have probably been taken from the N. E. D (under *then* 4<sup>b</sup>). The adversative force, however, is not expressed by *then* but by *but*. *Then* merely draws the hearer's attention to the contrast.<sup>1)</sup> In 'and then with infinite tact' I fail to see any notion of contrast. Neither do I feel any adversative element of *then* in: 'You do not believe in ghosts? *Then*, why are you afraid?' (p. 109). It has the function of a weak particle of inference. (N. E. D. then 5).

Appendix A. deals with the development of *hypotaxis* out of *parataxis*. In the earliest stages of the different languages there is a strong prevalence of paratactical construction. Instances of it are by no means rare in Mod. English, especially in the case of the relative clause and objective clause:

I saw the book you spoke of.  
He said he would come.

The relation between the two clauses was felt long before it was expressed. When, however, it required explicit expression, a temporal or local adverb or the demonstrative pronoun was used which became a part of the second clause. Finally the relation between the two clauses 'became stamped upon the particle, so that the latter came to stand for the relation itself'.

In Appendix B. the author clearly demonstrates that a shift from the temporal or spatial force to different notional conceptions has taken place in various other particles: whereas, while, rather, sooner, further. Besides this shift in meaning there is the shift from the demonstrative to the relative function, just as in the case of the comparative particle.

At the end of this scholarly essay we find an extensive bibliography which 'should prove of use to students of syntax generally', as the writer says in the preface.

Groningen.

A. BOSKER.

<sup>1)</sup> 'Then nach *but* wendet sich an den Hörer, er möge bedenken, dasz das durch *but* Eingeführte das im ersten Satze Gesagte erklärt' (Krüger, Syntax § 3359).

*The Vocabulary of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt. A phonological, morphological, etymological, semasiological and textual study.* Inaugural dissertation by J. K. WALLENBERG. Uppsala. 1923. 348 pp.

The dissertation before us is of a very different kind from some that have of late years been offered for a degree in English in Holland. No person except a specialist will care to read it, or will even be able to read it. No one will think of calling it amusing; but no one who is at all acquainted with the matter will deny that it is a sound piece of work redounding to the honour of the university that supplied a training that has enabled Dr. Wallenberg to write it. And I may add here that no one who in future wishes to study the text which is the subject of the young doctor's laborious work will be able to do so satisfactorily without using this book. It is of the same sound character as most of the Swedish dissertations that have come to my knowledge: it seems that the Swedish universities apply the old maxim *multum sed non multa*.

The author reviews the work done previously on this interesting text (interesting be it understood to students of the history of English) and comes to the conclusion that there was room for an investigation whose character is sufficiently indicated by the title. And I think he has made good his contention. By a strict comparison of the French original he has been able to interpret the English text, or to show that the monk misunderstood his original. In a great many cases he shows that the translation by Morris is wrong, thus contributing to Middle English lexicography. Details of phonology are dealt with both in the Vocabulary in the form of footnotes and in the form of a separate chapter discussing some special problems; for the author does not, as is by no means unfrequent in dissertations, repeat the results of his predecessors. As an example of the footnotes I may refer to the one on the long-standing *crux blepeliche* with *e* although it is connected with *blithe*, which occurs repeatedly in this text, but invariably with *i*. In the recent collection of Middle English prose and verse by Mr. Sisam a passage from Dan Michel is chosen in which the word happens to occur; but neither the editor nor Professor Tolkien in the accompanying *Glossary* is able to account for the form (I must add that the *Glossary* plainly states that the form is "obscure"). Dr. Wallenberg can state by his careful study of the text that the *e* occurs in the adverb only, never in the adjective, which suggests to him that the cause is a shortening of *ē* to short *e* in the third syllable from behind, of which he is able to quote several certain instances. Another characteristic example of the result of the author's careful methods is to be found in the chapter on the interpretation of the spelling *ss*. It had been argued that it could not mean *š* because it is found in *sseddest* (pt. 3 sg. of *say*), *ssed* (mod. English *seed*), and *sslazt* (ps. 3 sg. of *slay*). Prof. Björkman had observed that these cases might be scribal errors; our author shows that the first word is a form of *shed* (not of *say*), and that the second is a translation of French *ombre*, so that there can be no doubt but *shade* is meant. We need not discuss the third form, which is also accounted for by the author, as it is our purpose only to show the effect of Dr. Wallenberg's scholarly methods of study. We think we have said enough to show the character of the book and the promise it gives of an important addition to the ranks of scientific students of the English language.

*Rondom Shakespeare. I CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE: Edward II; II BEAUMONT & FLETCHER: Philaster.* Overgezet uit het Engelsch door DR. J. DECROOS, Lector aan de Universiteit te Münster. Uitgegeven door „De Sikkel” te Antwerpen en C. A. Mees te Santpoort.

A Series of Elizabethan plays translated into Dutch is appearing under the title: *Rondom Shakespeare*. The Editor Dr. J. Decroos, lecturer in the University of Münster, has translated the first two plays which have come out: Chr. Marlowe's *Edward II* and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*. The plays are provided with short introductions telling the principal facts about the authors' lives and mentioning some of their best plays. Admiration of the greatest artistic period in the history of English literature led Dr. Decroos to the task of making the Elizabethan playwrights and their works better known to the general public, who lose a standard by which to judge of Shakespeare, if he is separated from his time and surroundings. Shakespeare did not stand alone, and his genius can never be thoroughly understood and appreciated without some knowledge of his time and the playwrights among whom he lived and worked. Dr. Decroos quotes Goethe's remark to Eckermann, when he compares Shakespeare to the Mont Blanc, who ought to be approached by his great neighbours.

Dr. Decroos proves his good judgment in fixing upon Marlowe's *Edward II* as the first play of the series; recent critics, among whom A. C. Swinburne, rank Marlowe with the great poets of the world, and the influence Marlowe's tragedy had on Shakespeare's historical plays, especially on *Richard II*, ought not to be underrated. *Edward II* is Marlowe's maturest work and now recognised by Elizabethan scholars to be the first considerable history play in English. The second play of the series, *Philaster*, belongs to a later date; Marlowe, Shakespeare's predecessor, composed his plays before 1593; the authors of *Philaster* flourished when Shakespeare had already reached the zenith of his career, and may be regarded his immediate successors. *Philaster* was, according to Dryden, "the first play that brought Beaumont and Fletcher into esteem", and we know from contemporary accounts that this trag-i-comedy was exceptionally popular. Neither of the plays has been translated into Dutch before; of Marlowe's plays only *Dr. Faustus* was translated<sup>1)</sup>; and there exists a curious translation of Fletcher's *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* under the title *Stille Waters hebben Diepe Gronden*, dating from 1808.<sup>2)</sup>

Unlike the French Series of translations of Elizabethan plays giving prose versions of the texts<sup>3)</sup> Dr. Decroos offers a metrical rendering, which is, of course, a great advantage, as prose is bound to weaken the poetical text.

Dr. Decroos, who possesses a thorough knowledge of the English language, has done his work well; the translation is accurate and faithful to the text, the translator aims at perspicuousness, and nearly always the sense is clear. There are a few exceptions, as for example, the weak line in *Edward II*, when Mortimer says:

„Ik tegen mijnen neef niet meer.”

<sup>1)</sup> Marlowe's *Tragische Historie van Dr. Faustus*, vertaald en toegelicht door DR. S. Tjaden Modderman. Groningen, 1887.

<sup>2)</sup> *Stille Waters hebben Diepe Gronden*. Blijspel in vier bedrijven naar 't Hoogduitsch volgens Beaumont en Fletschers *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* door D. Onderwater. Leiden, 1808. A second edition appeared in 1833.

<sup>3)</sup> *Collection de Littérature Ancienne Française et Étrangère*; plays by Webster, Tourneur and Ford have appeared.

We can hardly understand this without the original text:

“not I, against my nephew.”<sup>1)</sup>

It is not necessary to make a perfect line; the short line, also in the original, lends the declaration greater force.

Sometimes, though very seldom, the translation seems to have missed the meaning; I am referring to the line in *Philaster*: “I’ll make this new report to be my knowledge” translated by: „Ik wil doen of was dit nieuw gerucht mij reeds bekend.”<sup>2)</sup> The meaning is: I’ll pretend that this rumour (that she is false) is not a report, but that I have the certain knowledge that it is the truth; the next line makes the sense quite clear: “I’ll swear I saw it.”

In *Edward II*<sup>3)</sup> the King’s words to the rebellious Lords, who are taken prisoners: “Now lusty Lords” translated by: „Nu, wilde Lords” seem vague and not to the point; ‘lusty’ in the seventeenth century had often the meaning of ‘insolent, self-confident, arrogant’, which is obviously the meaning here. Expressions like: „de prinses . . . nu wat van haar?” bear too much the mark of literal translations.

Dr. Decroos is on the whole very happy in finding equivalents for obsolete English expressions, perhaps due to the fact that many words occurring in 17th century writings became sooner obsolete in the Northern provinces; they were living longer, and are sometimes still alive, in Flemish. In the lines:

“But yet lift not your swords against the king.  
No; but we will lift Gaveston from hence”<sup>4)</sup>.)

translated by:

“Maar heft het zwaard niet tegen uwen vorst!  
Neen; Gaveston moet maar van hier zich heffen.”

the translator has rendered the play upon the word ‘lift’ successfully; ‘zich heffen’ in Flemish had the meaning of ‘to take oneself off’. Sometimes we find him less successful; it can hardly be called an improvement to use the uncommon expression “toen ik scheeplings kwam” for the simple words spoken by the queen “when I was embarked.”<sup>5)</sup>

Dr. Decroos’ translation is not only a faithful rendering of the text, but he has also aimed at giving an expressive version; in many fine scenes his rendering of the spirit and feeling of the original is very effective; I mention as excellent examples the King’s speech in the scene of abdication and the death-scene at Berkeley Castle, of which Charles Lamb wrote: “it moves pity and terror beyond any scene ancient or modern.” Naturally the translation of the scenes of simple sweetness of Beaumont and Fletcher’s tragi-comedy is bound to be a greater success than that of Marlowe’s ‘mighty line’ in the rhetorical poetry of this author’s tragedies.

Other additions to this series are announced at the back of the copies, namely *Dr. Faustus*, *De Witte Duivel*, *Perkin Warbeck*, *Volpone*, *Sejanus* and others; if I might venture a suggestion I would sooner recommend Webster’s *Duchess of Malfy* for translation than two plays by Ford; Webster is surely closer akin to Shakespeare than Ford.

Let us hope that Dr. Decroos may be successful in his praiseworthy attempt to make Dutch readers take a greater interest in Shakespeare’s contemporaries and that a closer acquaintance may tempt them to turn to the original texts.

Amsterdam.

W. P. FRIJLINCK.

<sup>1)</sup> I, iv. <sup>2)</sup> III, i. <sup>3)</sup> III, iii. <sup>4)</sup> *Edward II* I, ii. <sup>5)</sup> *Edward II* I, iv.

*J.-B.-A. Suard. Un introducteur de la littérature anglaise en France.* Par ALFRED C. HUNTER, Doct. de l'Univ. de Paris, B. A. (Lond. et Oxon.). Paris, Ed. Champion, 1925. 15 fr.

L'auteur a essayé de mettre en lumière la figure modeste et un peu pâlotte de l'Académicien Suard (1733—1817), et son rôle dans les échanges intellectuels entre l'Angleterre et la France; d'après des recherches d'archives il a précisé les événements de sa vie; *le Journal étranger* (1754 à 1762, dont Suard est le rédacteur de 1760 à 1762) et *la Gazette littéraire* (1764 à 1766) lui ont permis d'étudier sa valeur comme intermédiaire entre les deux pays. Le travail, qui a été admis à la Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, est solidement fait, bien composé et nous apprend tout ce qu'il faut sur Suard, son moi, son œuvre peu nombreuse et sans éclat, son rôle de traducteur besogneux, d'arriviste sans envergure, mais charmeur et habile, qui essaie de réussir grâce à Choiseul et à Pankoucke, son beau-père, un des éditeurs des Encyclopédistes; Suard a eu même l'honneur de voir son élection à l'Académie annulée par Louis XV, parce qu'on le considérait comme dangereux.

La valeur essentielle du travail de M. Hunter réside dans ses recherches sur l'œuvre de propagation de la littérature anglaise en France (ch. IV, V, VI et VII). Il y relève l'apport des 304 articles sur les ouvrages anglais par Suard, Diderot, Voltaire, Mme Necker, Saint Lambert, etc., donne des extraits importants de leurs idées sur la langue, la poésie, le théâtre, la prose des deux pays, met en évidence le rôle des deux périodiques pour la pénétration en France de l'œuvre de Young, de Gray, d'Ossian et, d'autre part, de Robertson ou de Cook. Suard, qui avait fait plusieurs séjours en Angleterre, paraît s'être désintéressé plus tard de son rôle d'introducteur de littérature anglaise: son *Journal de Paris* ni ses *Nouvelles politiques nationales et étrangères* n'apportent rien (sauf un article sur Sterne) dans ce domaine. D'ailleurs ce „philosophe”, dont l'esprit „philosophique” se rapproche de Voltaire, était fermé à certains aspects des choses d'Angleterre; son goût „ne fut aucunement supérieur à celui du journaliste le plus ordinaire” (p. 151); il se refuse à se donner la peine de chercher ce que c'est que l'humour anglais (p. 157) ou le non-conformisme (p. 147). Paresseux, mais studieux, jouant au pyrrhonien et au „philosophe” et resté catholique, produit raisonnable d'un siècle où l'on raisonne beaucoup, resté fondamentalement classique et „méconnaissant la valeur des belles lettres anglaises” (p. 158), il semble à M. Hunter qu'il fût „somme toute..... bien choisi pour le rôle d'intermédiaire entre l'Angleterre et la France”. (p. 161). Et j'en doute fort. Son œuvre fut „piteusement mince” (p. 163). Et nous ignorons ce qu'il a pu dire et faire dans son salon pour faire connaître l'Angleterre en France. Un intermédiaire à l'initiation féconde et hardie ? Non, un secrétaire né de rédaction ou d'Académie française.

M. Hunter a eu l'imprudence de vouloir faire son travail sans se documenter ou sans prendre connaissance des publications qui lui auraient permis de donner plus de valeur à son ouvrage. Il cite deux publications sur le préromantisme, celles de D. Mornet sur le *Romantisme en France au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* et de Paul van Tieghem sur *Ossian en France*, et l'article de F. Baldensperger sur *Young en France*, mais il ne connaît ni G. R. Havens sur *The Abbé Prévost and Engl. Liter.*, ni J. M. Telleen sur *Milton dans la Litt. fr.*, ni le livre de Paul van Tieghem sur *La poésie de la nuit et des tombeaux en Europe au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, ni son *Année littéraire*, ni le *Fréron* de F. Cornou, ni la „dissertation” de Johannes Gärtner, *Das Journal Etranger*.

und seine Bedeutung für die Verbreitung deutscher Literatur in Frankreich (Mainz 1905), ni celle de J. Sichel, *Die engl. Lit. im Journal étranger* (Heidelberg, 1906). Dans le domaine des études préromantiques il reste tant à faire, même après ces travaux, que c'est dommage de voir quelqu'un suivre une méthode de travail qui rendrait le progrès impossible.

D'ailleurs la thèse de Gärtner aurait pu lui éviter des erreurs à la page 29 : 1. 1<sup>re</sup> : Hugay de la Marche, qui en 1752 . . . . . lire : Hugary de la Marche-Courmont, qui le 19 mars 1753 (cfr. Gärtner, p. 8); l. 12 : deux années, lire : une année; idem, l. 14 : cette demi-douzaine de mauvais sujets, c'est ce qu'ils ne sont point (Cfr. Gärtner, p. 9 et 10); idem, l. 34 : pour le rôle de Jean-Jacques peu probable v. *Annales J. J. Rousseau*, XX, p. 76, note 1; idem, l. 36 Grimm . . . . . rédigea . . . . . non (v. la citation dans Gärtner p. 82, note 31). J'ai mis des points d'interrogation, nombreux, dans les marges de mon exemplaire : p. 4, Bayle est-il un incrédule; p. 18 et passim : Pryor, l. Prior; p. 20, Garrick était à Paris en 1751, non en 1752; p. 22, le titre de l'ouvrage de Béat de Muralt est *Lettres sur les Anglais et les Français*; p. 26. Rousseau est-il un nivelleur ? p. 78, Fréron s'appelle Elie-Catherine, non pas Jean; p. 83, je doute que les *Lettres anglaises* soient une mince affaire, considérées comme information solide, à côté des dix-huit volumes du *Pour et le Contre* (v. l'édition G. Lanson); p. 159. Mandeville était-il complètement oublié en Angleterre ? (v. la merveilleuse édition de M. J. Kaye de *The Fable of the Bees*).

Amsterdam.

K. R. GALLAS.

### A Cadger's Creel.

If Robert Louis Stevenson had lived, he would on the 13<sup>th</sup> November of the preceding year have reached the age of 75 years. The fact that he died in 1894, in the middle of his life and at the very beginning of the fullness of his talents, may have called forth not only the laments of his numerous admirers, but also the flow of articles and books that have appeared since his death. If ever an author was beloved, it was he. This love being suddenly transferred from the living man to his grave, broke loose in print. If a man of age dies, his death is accepted as a natural though lamentable fact; if a man dies at 44, the spirit revolts and tries to keep the image moving. After Stevenson's death there has been no end of memorial writings. His early home and haunts, his Scottish, his French, his American, his Pacific life, his faith, his style, his voyages, there is hardly any subject relating to him but it has been discussed.

Among those who gave praise to his memory there were not a few that had known him in the flesh. It is a very human quality to denounce a man, leastways to pay no attention to his existence, whilst he lives among us. Edinburgh gave him the cold shoulder in his student days and afterwards. He was a rather vain man who showed his disdain for the conventional by disregarding what was thought proper and by dressing himself down to what according to standing ideas was below him. I am not quite sure that all those who, in Miss Masson's *I Can Remember R. L. S.*, confess to have known him in his Edinburgh days and add some words of gratitude for the privilege, would have been eager to sue his acquaintance some fifty years ago.

About the 13<sup>th</sup> November of last year the R. L. S. club at Edinburgh held a large Bazaar, with the object of suitably furnishing and running the house No. 8 Howard Place, where Stevenson was born, and to the features of this Bazaar belonged a book, filled with some 35 pieces in prose and

poetry by admirers and friends.<sup>1)</sup>) The book has been edited by Sir George Douglas, Bart<sup>1</sup>, who in his foreword shows himself very pleased, as every Stevensonian will be pleased, by a short passage in prose, which was found in Stevenson's handwriting by Mr. Lloyd Osbourne, Stevenson's stepson, on the flyleaf of an old book of poetry. To quote Sir George's words 'this passage has the crowning Stevensonian charm that it is eminently self-revealing . . . . The attitude of a gay and gallant facing of life, in a spirit of childlike trust, is his more than any other writer's.'

This passage, inserted in the foreword, gives the book a peculiar charm.

Among the contributors to the book there are two that have known Stevenson in the flesh: John Geddie and Sir James Balfour Paul. The former gives a prose piece 'A Thunderstorm on the Cuillin', the Cuillin being a range of mountains in the middle of the Isle of Skye. Mr. Geddie gives a vivid description of what befell him while standing on one of the tops of these mountains. The piece has no direct relation to Stevenson, but I love to think, that Mr. Geddie was driven by intuition to the wild isles on the West Coast of Scotland, because they have inspired Stevenson to some of his most beautiful descriptions of their wild nature.

Sir James Balfour Paul, second cousin to Stevenson, repeats his recollections of a walk with his cousin as a boy along the beach at North Berwick. These recollections have been given formerly in Miss Masson's *I Can Remember R. L. S.* What struck him most was that Stevenson, two days before his death, wrote him a letter from Samoa with the following passage: 'it is such a long time since we got ducked together on the rocks in front of North Berwick, and you drove over from Whitekirk reading Washington Irving's *Mahomet*'. As to Sir James himself, he had forgotten all about the book.

I am at a loss what to take next. The pieces are not all about Stevenson. John Drinkwater, Hugh Walpole, Neil Munro, Lady Margaret Sackville, Stephen MacKenna, Ian Hay and Violet Jacob are among the authors.

John Drinkwater gives a short poem 'To RLS', which ends:

And if the wearier pedants cry  
Upon the ardour of your page,  
Your lyric sermons yet defy  
The chill severities of age,  
And daily still are honoured in the code  
Of youth upon the road.

Hugh Walpole, in a letter to RLS, makes Stevenson as a visitor of a bookshop compare the books that are just now sought for with those he wrote himself. 'But where are the stories?' asks Stevenson. 'Stories', says the bookseller, 'are not much considered nowadays, Sir, we've gone further than that; ideas are what the best writers are after.' Walpole consoles Stevenson with the communication that people read his books apparently more than they ever did. 'Romance', he goes on, 'as you interpret it, cannot have died out of the world, human nature is probably very much the same as it was, and you will leave the bookseller's darkened shop and climb the hills above your beloved city, and breathe the air and see the colours, and sniff the sea just as you were wont to do'.

'The Story-teller' by Neil Munro is a fine poem, written in 1894, of which I quote the last two stanza's:

<sup>1)</sup> *A Cadger's Creel*. The Book of the Robert Louis Stevenson Club Bazaar, edited by SIR GEORGE DOUGLAS, Bart. and published by William Brown, 18<sup>a</sup> and 18<sup>b</sup> George Street, Edinburgh (1925). 173 pp., 7/6 net.

So you are happed and gone, and there you're lying,  
 Far from the glens, deep down the slope of seas,  
 Out of the stormy night, the grey sleet flying,  
 And never again for you the Hebrides!  
 We need not keep the peat and cruisie glowing,  
 The goodwife may put bye her ale and bread,  
 For you, who kept the crack so blithely going,  
 Now sleep at last, silent and comforted.

Our Winter's here, the mists like wool are trailing,  
 The constant rain-smirr rots the fallen leaf,  
 Among the glens old Ossian's ghosts are wailing,  
 We'll bar the door and be alone with Grief;  
 But one last sprig of Highland heather's growing  
 Upon the hills of Home that well you knew,  
 And it (Oh tell him, wind that's southward blowing!),  
 My Wanderer, my Sennachie's for you.

Margaret Sackville gives a 'Little Conversation' without reference to Stevenson, Stephen MacKenna a speech, delivered to the Robert Louis Stevenson Club at the Annual Dinner of the Society, 13<sup>th</sup> November 1924. It is a very fine speech, in which MacKenna puts the question that if you were encountering Stevenson's manuscripts for the first time, if you were told that you must publish everything or nothing, what decision you would take. The question is pretty funny, but not altogether reasonable, so that when the proposer at last arrives at the conclusion that it will pay to publish the whole of Stevenson for the sake of one of his longer or a random collection of his shorter stories, one can readily agree, but we cannot consent to the opinion that the essays, the travels, the poems, in short all his other writings which have passed sentence lack one and all the touch of genius. I fear that this judgment has suffered by the strangeness of the demand.

Ian Hay gives a short prose-piece and Violet Jacob a poem 'The Northern Lights', suggested, I fancy, by the family tradition of the Stevensons.

'A Gathering of the Fragments' by William Roughead is worth mentioning on account of the way in which it imitates Stevenson's style. The 'Fragments' are the unfinished Novels: 'Weir of Hermiston', 'St Ives' and 'The Great North Road'.

Sir Charles Wakefield and the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson relate of visits to Samoa.

One of the prettiest tales in the book seems to me 'My Stevenson Find' by Joseph Laing Waugh. It would lead me too far to repeat the tale all along. It hinges upon a misunderstanding between the writer and a residenter of the Pentlands, whom he happened to meet while taking a rest at the roadside near Swanston. The old man tells him about a shilling piece which he got nearly sixty years ago from Rob Stevenson for a wager, how he lost that piece, because it dropped between the mantelpiece and the wall, how he got it back a week ago, when that mantelpiece was taken away, and how he keeps it in his pocket since.

It proves that the old man does not set very great store by that shilling piece and the writer of the tale, 'whose heart went pit-a-pat and who could scarcely control his voice', gets into possession of the piece in exchange for an other shilling and ten shillings to boot.

The writer goes with the old man to the neighbouring golf-links, where he offers him a whisky and soda and asks him to put his name to the end of a statement, in which he relates how that shilling came into his possession.

This done, the writer is about to leave, when he asks whether the old man is quite sure that the old velveteen jacket which Stevenson always wore, was brown in colour, because Stevenson's jacket used to be black.

'No, it was broon, I could sweir it was — a' the rat-catchers' jackets were broon.'

'Rat-catchers!' I gasped. 'In the name of goodness, what had rat-catching to do with the Stevensons?'

Weel, Sir, ye see, it was their trede. The Stev'sons o' Auld Pentlan' were the best rat-catchers in the Lothians. Henry Houk o' Biggar was knacky, I admit, but he couldna hauld a cankle to —'

And so it proves that old David Dunn — the old man — didn't know Robert Louis the author, but Rob the ratcatcher.

'Humbled, humiliated and broken in spirit', says the writer, 'I sat with ears that heard not and with eyes that did not see. Then I rose and brought the interview to a close.'

The frontispiece of the book is formed by a water-colour portrait of the old man by Henry W. Kerr. In fact there are many beautiful illustrations, for the greater part relating to the Stevenson-country. On page 88 I find a portrait of John Todd, the Shepherd, and I was pleased to find it. Whoever knows Stevenson and does not know John Todd, 'the ancestral and archetypal life, which alone remains permanently interesting, among everchanging forms and fashions which modern life has assumed' according to Mr. John A. Ross in *Good Words*, March 1895. John Todd, of whom Stevenson wrote that he saw him in his mind's eye 'perched on the hump of the declivity not far from Halkerside, his staff in airy flourish, his great voice taking hold upon the hills and echoing terror to the lowlands'.

G. LEOPOLD.

## Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*Beowulf*. Translated into Modern English rhyming verse, with introduction and notes, by ARCHIBALD STRONG. With a foreword on 'Beowulf and the Heroic Age' by R. W. CHAMBERS. Pp. LI + 100. Constable, 1925. 12/- net. [A review will appear.]

CYNEWULF — *Il Sogno della Croce — Cristo*: antichi poemetti anglosassoni, riveduti nel testo, con versione a fronte, introduzione et note a cura di Aldo Ricci. Firenze, G. S. Sansoni [1925], 16°, p. xxxiv + 204. L. it. 10.

*The Buik of Alexander*: Or the Buik of the Most Noble and Gallant Conqueror Alexander the Grit. By JOHN BARBOUR. Edited in four volumes from the unique printed copy in the possession of the Earl of Dalhousie, with Introductions, Notes, and Glossary, together with the French originals (*Li Fuerres de Gadres* and *Les Vœux du Paon*). Collated with numerous MSS. by R. L. GRÆME RITCHIE. 9 X 5 1/2. Vol. I., containing Part I. of the Buik of Alexander (namely, pp. 1-106 and *Li Fuerres de Gadres*). Edited from MS. 264 of Bodley's Library. cclxxxiv. + 210 pp. For the Scottish Text Society. Blackwood.

*Shakespeare's Sonnets*. A facsimile. 9 X 6 1/4. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

*Sonette*. Von WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. Erlautert von ALOIS BRANDL. Übersetzt von LUDWIG FULDA. Neue Ausgabe. 8vo, xlvii + 156 pp. Stuttgart u. Berlin: Cotta 1925. 8.— M.

*Dans les Sentiers de la Renaissance anglaise*. Par EMILE LEGOUIS. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 1925. Fr. 7.—.

*Songs From British Drama*. Edited by EDWARD BLISS REED. 9 1/4 X 6 1/4, xi. + 386 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 18s. n.

*The Poems of Richard Lovelace*. Edited by C. H. WILKINSON. In Two Volumes, 12 X 8, Vol. I., lxxxix. + 143 pp. Vol. II., viii. + 227 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford, £5 5s. n.

GRAY. Poetry and Prose. Edited by J. CROFTS. Pp. xii. + 176. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1926. 3/6 net.

*The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind.* By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. Edited from the Manuscripts. With Introduction, Textual and Critical Notes, by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. 9 $\times$ 6, lxii. + 614 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1925. 25s. n.

*New Verse:* Written in 1921. By ROBERT BRIDGES. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5, 82 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1925. 6s. n. [A review will appear.]

*Human Shows: Far Phantasies: Songs and Trifles.* By THOMAS HARDY. Macmillan, 1925. 7/6 net.

*The Best Poems of 1925.* Selected by THOMAS MOULT and Decorated by JOHN AUSTEN. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xiv. + 128 pp. Jonathan Cape. 6s. n.

*The Chapbook.* (A Yearly Miscellany.) Edited by HAROLD MONRO. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  7, 114 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1925. 5s. n.

*The Deluge, and Other Poems.* By R. C. TREVELYAN. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 47 pp. Hogarth Press. 5s. n.

*I Heard a Sailor.* By WILFRID GIBSON. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , x. + 123 pp. Macmillan. 4s. 6d. n.

*Humoresque.* By HUMBERT WOLFE. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 87 pp. E. Benn. 6s. n.

*Selected Poems.* By ALDOUS HUXLEY. 8  $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 63 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 5s. n.

*Poor Young People.* By EDITH, OSBERT, and SACHEVERELL SITWELL. With drawings by ALBERT RUTHERSTON. 10  $\times$  7 $\frac{3}{4}$ , 60 pp. "The Fleuron." 42s. n.

*English Poems.* By EDMUND BLUNDEN. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6, 127 pp. Cobden Sanderson. 6s. n.

*A Book of Twentieth-Century Scots Verse.* Selected by WILLIAM ROBB. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xii. + 259 pp. Gowans and Grey. 6s. n.

*The Anatomy of Melancholy.* In Two Volumes. What it is, with all the Kinds, Causes, Symptomes, Prognosticks, and Several Cures of it. In three Partitions, Philosophically, Medicinally, Historically, Opened and Cut-up. By DEMOCRITUS JUNIOR. With a Satyricall Preface. Illustrated by McKNIGHT KAUFFER. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  8 $\frac{1}{2}$ , Vol. I., 300 pp. Vol. II., pp. 301-591. Nonesuch Press. £5 5s.

*The Oxford Book of English Frose.* Chosen and Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xx. + 1,092 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: 1925. 8s. 6d. n.

*In a German Pension.* By KATHERINE MANSFIELD. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5, x. + 144 pp. Constable. 6s. n.

*The Plumed Serpent.* (Quetzalcoatl.) By D. H. LAWRENCE. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 476 pp. Martin Secker. 7s. 6d. n.

*No More Parades.* A Novel. By FORD MADOX FORD. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 319 pp. Duckworth. 1925. 7s. 6d. n.

*Odtaa.* A Novel. By JOHN MASEFIELD. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 343 pp. Heinemann. 7s. 6d. n.

*Broomsticks, and Other Tales.* By WALTER DE LA MARE. With Designs by BOLD. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 378 pp. Constable. 1925. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Clayhanger Family.* I., Clayhanger. II., Hilda Lessways. III.. These Twain. By ARNOLD BENNETT. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , ix. + 1,302 pp. Methuen. 1925. 10s. 6d. n.

*Whom God Hath Sundered:* A Trilogy. By OLIVER ONIONS. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 703 pp. Martin Secker. 1925. 7s. 6d. n.

*Fulgens and Lucres.* A Fifteenth-Century Secular Play. By HENRY MEDWALL. Edited by F. S. BOAS and A. W. REED. Pp. xxvii + 104. Clarendon Press, 1926. [A review will appear.]

*The Spanish Tragedy, with Additions, 1602. Edward the Second.* By CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  7. (The Malone Society Reprints). The Malone Society. 1925.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE: *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar.* With an introduction and notes by DR. H. DE GROOT. 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\times$  18 $\frac{1}{2}$ , c.M. Pp. xxxvii + 132. Kemink, 1926. F. 1.50: geb. F. 1.95.

*Volks-Scene in dem Drama Sir Thomas More, Shakespeare zugeschrieben.* (Druck der Ernst Ludwig Presse zu Darmstadt. Hergestellt Februar 1925 für die Veranstalter und Subskribenten der Shakespeare-Gesamt-Ausgabe der Ernst Ludwig Presse.) roy. 8vo.

*Representative Plays.* By HENRY ARTHUR JONES. Edited, with Historical, Biographical, and Oritical Introductions, by CLAYTON HAMILTON. In Four Volumes. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , Vol. I., xlvi. + 357 pp. Vol. II., xx. + 363 pp. Vol. III., xxvi. + 371 pp. Vol. IV., xx. + 344 pp. Macmillan. 10s. 6d. n. each volume.

*Don Juan: A Play in Three Acts.* By JAMES ELROY FLECKER. With a Preface by HELLÉ FLECKER. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xiv. + 160 pp. Heinemann. 1925. 6s. n.

*Plays of To-Day.* In Two Volumes, 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ . First Volume. — *Chains* (Elizabeth Baker):

*Abraham Lincoln* (John Drinkwater); *Jane Clegg* (St. John Ervine); *The Voysey Inheritance* (Granville Barker); *Hindle Wakes* (Stanley Houghton); 444 pp. Second Volume. — *Prunella* (Laurence Housman and H. Granville Barker); *The New Sin* (B. Macdonald Hastings); *Pompey the Great* (John Masefield); *Mary Broome* (Allan Monkhouse); *Rutherford and Son* (Githa Sowerby; 384 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 1925. 5s. n. each volume.

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*Die lateinischen Rätsel der Angelsachsen.* Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Altenglands. By ERIKA VON ERHARDT-SIEBOLD. 8vo, xvi. + 276 pp. Heidelberg: Winter 1925 = Anglistische Forschungen 61.

*English Illuminated Manuscripts from the Tenth to the Thirteenth Century.* By ERIC G. MILLAR. 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  × 11, xii. + 146 pp. 100 plates. Paris and Brussels: G. van Oest. £5 5s. n.

*The Chaucer Tradition.* By AAGE BRUSENDORFF. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 509 pp. Copenhagen: V. Pio. Poul Branner. London: Milford. 16s. n.

*Geschichte der englischen Autobiographie von Chaucer bis Milton.* By DOROTHEA HENDRICH. Phil. Diss. Berlin 1925. 8vo, 48 pp. Leipzig: Mayer u. Müller 1925. 2. — M.

*The Jew in Early English Literature.* By H. MICHELSON. 24 × 16 c.M. Pp. xii. + 175. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1926.  
Diss. Amsterdam.

*Die historische Volksballade der Engländer und Schotten.* Von H. EICKER. 8vo, vii. + 155 pp. Leipzig: Quelle u. Meyer 1926. = Neue anglistische Arbeiten. Nr. 7.

*Shakespeares Sonette* (Gruppierung, Kunstform). Aus dem Nachlasse von DR. RUDOLF FISCHER herausg. von DR. KARL BRUNNER. Pp. viii. + 182. Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, LIII. 1925. M. 4. — [A review will appear.]

*The Original Order of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* By SIR DENYS BRAY. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xvi. + 130 pp. Methuen. 1925. 5s. n.

*The Sources of Hamlet: with Essay on the Legend* by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANZ. Pp. x. + 321. The Shakespeare Classics. Milford, 1926. 3/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Shakespeare's Handwriting and the Northumberland Manuscript.* The Latest "Shakespeare" Mare's Nest. By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ , 31 pp. Watts. 1925. 1s. n.

*The Stratford Bust and the Droeshout Engraving.* By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 71 pp. Cecil Palmer. 2s. 6d. n.

*Shakspere's Debt to Montaigne.* By GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 66 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

*Studies in Shakespeare, Milton, and Donne.* By Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 232 pp. Macmillan Co.

*Die Lösung der Shakespeare-Frage.* By C. G. MUSKAT. 8vo, 31 pp. Leipzig: Reisland 1925.

*Genie und Character.* Shakespeare — Lessing — Goethe — Schiller — Schopenhauer — Wagner. Von ROBERT SAITSCHICK. 2., verm. u. verb. Aufl. m. 6. Bild. 8vo. viii. + 359 pp. Darmstadt u. Leipzig: Hofmann & Co. 1926. M. 6.50.

*Ben Jonson's Art: Elizabethan Life and Literature as Reflected Therein.* By ESTHER CLOUDMAN DUNN. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xvi. + 159 pp. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College.

*Othello in French.* By MARGARET GILMAN. Bibl. de la Rev. de Litt. Comp. XXI. Pp. vii. + 197. Paris, Champion, 1925. 15 Fr. [A review will appear.]

*Occasional Papers published for Members of the Samuel Pepys Club.* Edited by PHILIP NORMAN. Vol II., 1917—1923. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xv. × 229 pp. For the Club at the Chiswick Press.

*The Life of Tomaso the Wanderer.* An attack upon Thomas Killigrew by RICHARD FLECKNOE. Reprinted from the original of 1667. 11 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 9, 13 pp. P. J. and A. E. Dobell. 6s. n.

*Essays in Biography 1680—1726.* By BONAMY DOBRÉE. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , vii. + 362 pp. Milford. 12s. 6d. net.

*Supplement to the Letters of Horace Walpole.* Fourth Earl of Oxford, together with upwards of 150 letters addressed to Walpole between 1735 and 1796. Chronologically arranged and edited with Notes and Indices by PAGET TOYNBEE, M.A., D. Litt. With Portraits. Vol. III.: 1744—1797. 8 × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xxxi. + 450 pp. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

*A Study in Smollett.* Chiefly "Peregrine Pickle". With a Complete Collation of the First and Second Editions. By HOWARD SWAZEE BUCK. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 216 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 14 s. net.

*J.-B.-A. Suard.* Un introducteur de la littérature anglaise en France. Par A. C. HUNTER. Bibl. Rev. Litt. Comp. XXII. Pp. vii + 193. Paris, Champion, 1925. 15 Fr. [See review.]

*The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne.* By WILBUR B. CROSS. In Two Volumes. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I., xxii + 287 pp. Vol. II., 333 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 31 s. 6 d. net.

*Bluestocking Letters.* Selected with an Introduction by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ . xiv. + 282 pp. John Lane. 6 s. net.

*Burns from a New Point of View.* By SIR JAMES CRICHTON-BROWNE. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ . vii + 92 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 3 s. 6 d. net.

*The Romantic Theory of Poetry.* An Examination in the Light of Croce's Ästhetic. By A. E. POWELL (Mrs. E. R. Dodds). 9  $\times$  6, vii. + 263 p.p. Arnolds. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*GUIDO FERRANDO. Coleridge.* Studio Critico. Firenze, Succ. Le Monnier. 1925. Pp. 198. L. 10.—.

*The Letters of Jane Austen.* Selected with an introduction by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , viii. + 190 pp. John Lane, 6 s. net.

*The Life of William Godwin.* By FORD K. BROWN. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xv. + 387 pp. Dent. 16 s. n.

*The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library.* Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley and others mainly unpublished, from the Collection presented to the Library by Lady Shelley in 1892. Edited by R. H. HILL. With a Chronological Table of the Collection and a List of other Shelley Manuscripts and Relics in the Library. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  7 $\frac{3}{4}$ , xv. + 48 pp. Oxford: Bodleian Library. 1926. 5 s. net. [A review will appear.]

*Die invloed van Keats en Shelley in Nederland gedurende die negentiende eeu.* Deur DR. G. DEKKER. 24  $\times$  16 c.M. Pp. 250. Wolters, 1926. f 5.90. [A review will appear.]

*The Pilgrim of Eternity: Byron—A Conflict.* By JOHN DRINKWATER. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xv. + 416 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 1925. 18 s. net.

*La Fortuna di Byron in Inghilterra.* By MARIO PRAZ. Florence, La Voce; London, Truslove and Hanson. 11 lire.

*William Cobbett.* By G. K. CHESTERTON. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 277 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 6 s. n.

*The Halliford Edition of the Works of Thomas Love Peacock.* Edited by H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH and C. E. JONES. 9  $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. IX. Critical and Other Essays. ix. + 459 pp. Vol. X. Dramatic Criticisms and Translations and Other Essays. 329 pp. Constable. 21 s. n. each.

*Some Aspects of Business Life in Early Victorian Fiction.* By H. JANSONIUS. 24  $\times$  16 c.M. Pp. xvi. + 206. J. Muusses, Purnierend. 1926.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*The Days of Dickens.* A Glance at Some Aspects of Early Victorian Life in London. By ARTHUR L. HAYWARD. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xiv. + 280 pp. Routledge. 15 s. net.

*Harriet Martineaus sozialpolitische Novellen.* Von ELISABETH ESCHER. 8vo, 108 pp. Phil. Diss. Zurich 1925.

*Tennyson as seen by his Parodists.* By J. POSTMA. 24  $\times$  16 c.M. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1926. Diss. Amsterdam.

*Swinburne.* By HAROLD NICOLSON. 8  $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{3}$ , viii. + 207 pp. Macmillan. 5 s. n.

*ALICE GALIMBERTI. L'Aedo d'Italia.* Algernon Charles Swinburne. Con versioni originali, ritratti e facsimile, etc. Palermo, R. Sandron, 1925. xiv. + 602. Lire 25.

Apart from a chapter on Mazzini and Swinburne (Capitolo III, p. 45 foll.), a few remarks on Carducci's acquaintance with Sw.'s poems p. 161, and a short letter of Swinburne to Signor Tancredi Galimberti, here printed for the first time p. 74-76 and facsimile, the book is of no interest whatever.

*The Letters of Bret Harte.* Assembled and Edited by GEOFFREY BRET HARTE. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  6, xviii. + 515 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 21s. n.

*Le Génie d'Edgar Poe.* Par C. MAUCLAIR. Albin Michel. 1925. Fr. 10.—.

*L'influence du naturalisme français sur les Romanciers anglais de 1885 à 1900.* Par W. C. FRIERSON. Paris, Champion. Fr. 12.—.

*Character and Environment in the Novels of Thomas Hardy.* By HERBERT B. GRIMSDITCH. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 189 pp. Witherby. 1925. 6s. n.

*Letzte Briefe.* Von OSCAR WILDE. Deutsch von MAX MEYERFELD. 8vo, 172 pp. Berlin: S. Fischer 1925. 6.— M.

*The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh (1879-1922).* Edited by LADY RALEIGH. With a preface

by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. In two volumes.  $9 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I., xxvii. + 272 pp. Vol. II., xiii. + 273-579 pp. Methuen. 30s. n.

*Sir Adolphus William Ward*, 1837-1924. By T. F. TOUT. (The British Academy.)  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 14 pp. Milford. 2s. n.

*The Letters of Maurice Hewlett*. Edited with a Preface by LAURENCE BINYON.  $9 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xi. + 284 pp. Methuen. 18s. n.

*Last Essays*. By JOSEPH CONRAD.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , xvii. + 253 pp. Dent. 7s. 6d. n.

*G. Bernard Shaw*. By G. K. CHESTERTON. 8vo, 239 pp. Wien: Praidon-Verlag 1925. 4.80 M.

*Gegen Shaw*. Eine Streitschrift. Mit einer Shaw-Parodie des Verfassers. Von HERBERT EULENBERG. 8vo, 77 pp. Dresden: Reissner 1925. 2.— M.

*Mr. Shaw and "The Maid"*. By J. M. ROBERTSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , vi. + 115 pp. R. Cobden-Sanderson. 5s. n. [A review will appear.]

*Gilbert Keith Chesterton*. Umriss seiner Künstlerpersönlichkeit und Proben seines Schaffens. Von KARL ARNS. 8vo, 88 pp. Dortmund-Würzburg: Wolfram-Verlag 1925. 1.80 M.

*Things That Have Interested Me*. By ARNOLD BENNETT. Third Series.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , viii. + 272 pp. Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Background of English Literature* and other collected Essays and Addresses. By H. J. C. GRIERSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , vii. + 290 pp. Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d. n.

*Studies of English Poets*. By J. W. MACKAIL.  $9 \times 6$ , xii. + 251 pp. Longmans. 10s. 6d. n.

*Poetry and Criticism*. By EDITH SITWELL. (The Hogarth Essays).  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 28 pp. Hogarth Press. 2s. 6d. n.

*Modern Poetry*. By H. P. COLLINS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 224 pp. Jonathan Cape. 6s. n.

*A Casual Commentary*. By ROSE MACAULAY.  $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , viii. + 243 pp. Methuen. 6s. n.

*The Comic and Realistic in English Drama*. By JOHN B. MOORE.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , viii. + 231 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 10s. n.

*The Element of Irony in English Literature*. An Essay by F. McD. C. TURNER.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , vii. + 109 pp. Cambridge University Press. 5s. n.

*English Satire and Satirists*. By HUGH WALKER.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , x. + 325 pp. Dent. 7s. 6d. n.

*India in English Literature*. By ROBERT SENCOURT.  $9 \times 6$ , xi. + 468 pp. Simpkin, Marshall. 18s. n.

*Essays and Studies*. By Members of the English Association. Vol. XI. Collected by OLIVER ELTON.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 169 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1921-1923.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , xx. + 579 pp. For the British Academy, by Milford. 40s. n.

*The Old Vic*. By CICELY HAMILTON and LILIAN BAYLIS.  $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , 285 pp. Jonathan Cape. 12s. 6d. n.

#### LANGUAGE.

*Mittelenglische Originalurkunden*. (1405-1430). Von H. M. FLASDIECK. Pp. 110. Heidelberg, Winter. 1926. M. 5.— [A review will appear.]

*Die Nordischen Lehnwörter bei Gavin Douglas*. Von JOSEF HOFMANN. 8vo, XIII, 95 pp. Phil. Diss. München 1925.

*Englische Wortkunde*. Von PHILIPP ARONSTEIN. Pp. viii. + 130. Teubner, 1925. Geh. M. 5.—; geb. M. 6.— [A review will appear.]

*De Intonatie van het Nederlands met inbegrip van een Vergelijking met de Engelse Intonatie*. Door L. J. GUITTAART.  $24 \times 16$  c.M. Pp. 117. Utrecht, Kemink, 1925. F. 2.50. Diss. Amsterdam.

*Handbuch der Englischen Grammatik*. Von MAX DEUTSCHBEIN, H. MUTSCHMANN und H. EICKER. 8vo, xvi. + 280 pp. Leipzig: Quelle u. Meyer, 1926. 8.— M.

*A Grammar of Late Modern English* for the use of Continental, especially Dutch, students. By H. POUTSMA. Part II: The Parts of Speech. Section II, The Verb and the Particles.  $24 \times 16$  c.M. Pp. vii. + 891. P. Noordhoff, Groningen, 1926. Sewed Fl. 16.50; cloth Fl. 18.00. [See Article in this issue.]

*The English Language in America*. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. In Two Volumes.  $9 \times 6$ . Vol. I., xv. + 377 pp. Vol. II., v. + 355 pp. New York: Century Co. 1925. London: Milford. 42s. n. [A review will appear.]

*A Dictionary of Modern English Usage.* By H. W. FOWLER. Pp. viii. + 742. Clarendon Press, 1926. Price 7/6 net. [A review will appear.]

K. TEN BRUGGENCATE: *Engelsch Woordenboek.* Eerste deel: Engelsch-Nederlandsch. Tiende, omgewerkte en vermeerderde uitgave door A. BROERS. 19 $\times$ 13 c.M. Pp. viii. + 838. Wolters, 1926. F. 3.75.

*Englisch—Deutsches und Deutsch—Englisches Taschenwörterbuch.* Von J. E. WESSELY. 39. Aufl. völlig umgearb. u. ergänzt von WALTER EBISCH. 8vo. viii + 227 + 328 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz 1926.

#### HISTORY; BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*The Medieval Village.* By G. G. COULTON. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{4}$ . xxx + 603. Cambridge University Press, 1925. 25/- net. [A review will appear.]

*Elizabethan Life in Town and Country.* By M. ST. CLARE BYRNE. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 294 pp. Methuen. 7 s. 6 d. net.

*Life and Work of the People of England.* A Pictorial Record from Contemporary Sources. By DOROTHY HARTLEY and MARGARET M. ELLIOT. (The "People's Life and Work" Series.) The Fifteenth Century. 129 pp. The Sixteenth Century. 129 pp. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Batsford. 4 s. 6 d. net each.

*England in the Nineteenth Century.* Edited by P. GEYL and E. KRUISINGA. Vol. II, 1860—1901. Pp. 210. Utrecht, Kemink, 1926. f. 1.95.

*A Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature.* By C. S. NORTHUP. With contributions by J. Quincey Adams and A. Keogh. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Pp. ix + 507. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 1925. Price \$ 5.00. [A review will appear.]

*The Ashley Library.* A catalogue of printed books, manuscripts, and autograph letters. Collected by THOMAS JAMES WISE. Vol. VII., 10 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  8, xiv. + 220 pp. 1926. For private circulation.

*A Bibliographical Catalogue of the Published Novels and Ballads of William Harrison Ainsworth.* By HAROLD LOCKE. 9  $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 68 pp. Elkin Mathews. 7 s. 6 d. net.

*Bibliography of the Writings of John Addington Symonds.* By PERCY L. BABINGTON. 9  $\times$  7 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xi + 244 pp. John Castle. 25 s. net.

*A Bibliography of the First Editions of Published and Privately Printed Books and Pamphlets by Austin Dobson.* Compiled by ALBAN DOBSON. With a Preface by SIR EDMUND GOSSE. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{3}{4}$ , xii + 88 pp. First Edition Club. 15 s. net.

*The Works of H. G. Wells.* A Bibliography, Dictionary, and Subject-Index, 1887—1925. By GEOFFREY H. WELLS. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xxv. + 274 pp. Routledge. 12 s. 6 d. net.

*The Year's Work in English Studies.* Vol. V., 1924. Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. 9  $\times$  6, xii + 18 pp. Milford. 1925. 7 s. 6 d. net.

*An Outline of English Education, 1760-1902.* By JOHN WILLIAM ADAMSON. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  6, 74 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1925. 3s. n.

Reprinted from the "Cambridge History of English Literature."

*Robinson Crusoe and Its Printing.* 1719-1731: A Bibliographical Study, by HENRY CLINTON HUTCHINS. With a foreword by A. EDWARD NEWTON. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$   $\times$  8, xix. + 201 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 1925. 50s. n.

*A Bibliography of Samuel Johnson.* A Reissue of the Edition of 1915. Illustrated with Facsimiles. 8vo (9  $\times$  6), pp. viii. + 186, with 38 facsimiles. Milford. 1925. 30s. net.

*Bibliographies of Modern Authors.* (Second Series.) John Davidson, Ernest Dowson, Katherine Mansfield, Alice Meynell, Walter Pater, Francis Thompson. Compiled and edited by C. A. and H. G. STONEHILL. 9  $\times$  6, xiii. + 162 pp. John Castle. 1925. 18s. n.

*Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature.* Vol. V, 1924. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by A. C. PAUES, Ph. D. Pp. 164. Bowes & Bowes, Cambridge, 1925. Price 6s. net. [See Review, Dec. 1925.]

*Jahresberichte des Literarischen Zentralblattes.* Jahrgang 2, 1925. Englische und amerikanische Sprache und Literatur. Von EGON MÜHLBACH. Pp. 351—362. Leipzig, 1926.

# A Guide to English Studies.

## The Study of the History of English<sup>1)</sup>.

Now that I have to deal with the study of the history of English as part of the preparation of schoolmasters for their task, I feel that it is unavoidable to discuss the question whether such a study is really as reasonable as examination programmes in this country suggest. The question is not easy to answer, as is the way with questions of educational policy. Theoretical answers are generally too vague to convince those that one wants to convince, and are apt to be approved only of those who were inclined to agree before they heard the argument. And practical illustrations are easily looked upon as exceptional cases. I might quote my own experience and that of friends, as of a girl asking why the English use a foreign word for such a simple idea as *second*, why they say *eve* when they mean the day before, or how it is that *of* is used in *deprived of*, although the pupil had been told that Dutch *van* when expressing separation is rendered by *from*. Schoolmasters who are accustomed to encourage questions by giving real and satisfying answers to those that intelligent pupils put them, know that they repeatedly discover gaps in their knowledge of their own subject that they would like to fill up, although their official duties often make it impossible. But such practical illustrations of the necessity of historical language studies, even if accepted as generally correct, do not prove that such a study is bound to affect the whole spirit of the teaching, and it is here that its influence is most important. To those who doubt this I should like to point out the meaning of the following experience. A schoolmaster without a real command of spoken English is apt to declare that the most important thing for his pupils is an ability to read English. A schoolmaster with little natural aptitude for literature and less knowledge of it, is generally found to declare that there is no room for literature in our secondary schools. A master without a living knowledge of phonetics is frequently heard to express his conviction that phonetics are no use in the classroom, or anywhere else. A man who does not know grammar except in the form of a set of rules which he has learned to repeat like a parrot, is sure to say that English can be taught with hardly any grammar. A schoolmaster without any knowledge of English history and institutions has been heard saying that the scientific (o sacred word!) study of English history is too serious and exacting a branch of knowledge for anyone to undertake it as a subsidiary subject. And in the same way, finally, a man without a living knowledge of the history of English, an extremely frequent case, is almost invariably found to hold the opinion that a knowledge of the history of the English language is one of those things a 'practical' schoolmaster can safely neglect without any harmful results (this word *practical* is a passe-partout of the same kind as the word *scientific*, only used by a different group). All these expressions of 'opinion', I am certain, are only samples

<sup>1)</sup> The preceding chapters of this 'Guide' have dealt with the study of Present-Day English (E. S. VII, 33 ff.), and of Old English and Middle English (E. S. VII, 129 ff.); in a way the article on the methods of studying O.E. syntax in the April number may be looked upon as belonging to the series.

of the self-protective devices by which the 'intellectual' man in our complicated social life tries to defend his right of existence. It would probably be easy to add parallels from more primitive societies. At any rate, I do not think it worth while to try to refute them: it is sufficient to consider what the cumulative effect of all the 'opinions' quoted would be on the programme of the studies for English schoolmasters! Of course, none of these 'opinions' is really absurd; there is *some* truth in each of them, only within very definite limits, and I believe that no master can contentedly be conscious of ignorance of any side of the subject which it is his daily task to teach. Ignorance may be, indeed is, unavoidable, but it remains to be regretted, not to be gloried in<sup>1)</sup>.

Although, then, we firmly believe in the value of linguistic studies for future schoolmasters, it would be useless to deny that the interest taken in these studies by the majority of students is generally small. I venture to express a doubt whether the interest that is more frequently taken in 'literature' is in most cases a genuine interest in its *study*. Browsing in a field, and talking about it and about it, is a different matter from cultivating it. The latter implies sweat, a distasteful word, and thing, to many professed students. As a regretted contributor to this periodical once expressed it: "The sensation of the 'interesting' is the demand many undergraduates also make on their professors. It seems they require more approximation and assimilation between University and teashop. Now it is the safest plan, in the long run, to live on plain, substantial food, without any special tickling of the palate. And we, for our part, are of opinion that those only ought to go to a university who are trained and accustomed to like the black or brown bread of the Baker or Professor." (Dr. P. Vrijlandt, E. S. V, 75).

The want of 'interest' in philological studies is not a phenomenon peculiar to Holland, but seems to be international. As to England, linguistic interest has never been very great there; this can hardly be otherwise in a country where foreign languages are rarely known, and interest in foreigners, except for business purposes, is exceptional. Still, when we find Professor Wyld declaring, that "in spite of all the universities now existing in this country, linguistic knowledge and training among the majority of highly cultivated persons are at very low ebb," there is reason to remember that there was a time when the University of Oxford established a Chair of comparative philology, and even appointed a foreigner (Max Müller) to the post. And now this chair left vacant by the resignation of Professor Joseph Wright, if we are correctly informed, is not going to be filled up. In Germany a well-known scholar recently complained of the scarcity of men able to succeed the great linguistic scholars who have made Germany the leading country in almost all branches of linguistics. In France there is, indeed, a brilliant school of general linguistics, just as Holland can boast of Uhlenbeck and the students of Semitic and Eastern languages, but with regard to modern languages, as well as with regard to the public interest in matters of language, there seems little doubt that France and Holland have no reason to consider themselves superior to England. The cause is not

<sup>1)</sup> Schools would greatly benefit if schoolmasters would draw the practical consequences of such ignorance, and refrain from teaching parts of their subject of which they have no living knowledge. Thus a 'non-literary' man should not waste the time of his pupils over poetry that he does not really appreciate, and a 'non-grammatical' man should not attempt to teach more than the elementary grammar that is indispensable. There is, in any case, no time for everything to be done well.

the obstinate ignorance of the general public only, although there is no doubt of that ignorance. It must also be said that the students of language have failed to persuade the public that linguistics is a real science, as schoolmasters have failed in the schools to train a generation with an intelligent interest in matters of language. The failure of the advocates of spelling reform in Holland to carry their programme, in spite of the inevitableness of their success in the long run, is the clearest proof of the bottomless ignorance, among educated people, of all things concerning principles of language. The mild but real interest in language study that existed in the nineteenth century is gone; this reaction, however, was partly inevitable. The time when students of language could promise to open up new fields of human history, and could hope to show the origin of language, and to trace the history of man back to a time of which we have no other knowledge<sup>1</sup>), is irrecoverably past. Linguistics has given up those youthful dreams, and has become a sober science. But what it has to offer in return for those dreams is not so little. Only unfortunately, it is a sort of knowledge that does not appeal to an ignorant public of outsiders, anxious for the excitement of novelty. It offers us an insight into the working of the human mind, and robs us of the fancy beloved by classical students that the languages of civilized nations are superior as languages to those of benighted savages. On the contrary, linguists have a knack of taking the greatest interest in the languages of primitive peoples. And those that treat the better known languages and their history cannot be understood without some hard work, so that the general educated public is often even unaware of these studies. But the future schoolmaster, if he is to combat this general ignorance and to train a generation in sound ideas of language, must surely be taught these ideas first. And a training in the history of some language (it does not much matter which) has generally been found the best means, together with a minute study of living languages, to supply that general linguistic basis. Without a historical study, it is certainly not impossible, but at any rate more difficult for the student to free himself from the popular idea of language as a thing to be handled, a tool to be used, and polished, instead of looking upon language as a human function, an *energeia*, as Humboldt in a famous phrase expressed it, not an *ergon*. The study of the classical languages in this country, which is, in some universities at least, still based on the linguistic ideas (or absence of linguistic ideas) prevalent in the seventeenth century, is sufficient warning what the results are of a study at least of a dead language without regarding the progress of linguistics in the last hundred years<sup>2</sup>).

The first question for the student who wishes to enter upon a course of historical English is where to begin. It is a problem that crops up in all branches of historical study, and can never be solved without some arbitrariness. We have discussed the question in an earlier chapter of this *Guide* (English Studies vol. VII. p. 131). It is enough, therefore, to declare that the study of Gotic should be included, not for its own sake, but as a means of forming an idea of what Primitive Germanic was like. The number

<sup>1</sup>) It may not be superfluous to point out that this does not preclude the possibility of linguistics being useful in these historical studies, but only in combination with other sources of knowledge.

<sup>2</sup>) There are exceptions, fortunately, also among the coming generation of classical schoolmasters. For evidence, see a recent number of the *Mededelingen* of the *Kon. Akademie* (vol. 61, A no. 2), *Over Taalverwantschap* by N. G. H. Deen (Leiden).

of introductions to Gotic is legion, and all are probably more or less useful. For we know really little of Gotic, and what we know is on the whole perfectly clear, so that Gotic may be looked upon as one of the easiest languages the student will ever learn. One of the oldest books, and in many respects the most commendable, is the *Gotische Grammatik* by Braune; it is a small book, containing all that it is necessary to know about sounds and forms from a descriptive point of view. A fuller account, including syntax and a historical treatment of sounds and accidente, is to be found in Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, which has been reprinted several times. Streitberg has also edited the whole of Wulfila's bible-translation, and the few stray texts that have come down to us; the text of the bible-translation is accompanied by an edition of the Greek original, without which no study of the Gotic text can be completely satisfactory. For a look at the Greek original warns us at once if we have a literal rendering of a series of Greek words before us, or a real Gotic sentence. A complete edition of the texts with a grammar and glossary is also found in Stamm-Heyne's *Ulfilas*, of which the thirteenth and fourteenth editions have been edited by Ferdinand Wrede. A very instructive little book that may serve as a companion to any of those mentioned is the *Einführung in das Gotische* by Sigmund Feist. It is one of the useful series of *Philologische Studienbücher* published by Teubner (at very reasonable prices). Feist gives short introductions and texts with footnotes explaining them both from a descriptive and historical grammatical point of view; his book will be found invaluable by those who cannot attend lectures on Gotic and Old Germanic grammar. For Dutch students, finally, there is a book that has much to recommend it, although the author is not thoroughly acquainted with modern linguistics: the *Gotisch Handboek* by Professor Van Hamel (Tjeenk Willink).

The study of Gotic is introductory only to a study of Primitive Germanic. For those to whom this study is no more (and no less) than a station on the highway to English studies, the best introduction, it seems to me, is Professor Meillet's *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*, which first appeared during the World War (1916) and has been reprinted at least once since (1922). It is admirably clear, clearer in many cases, no doubt, than the facts warrant, but this is a virtue in an elementary book. Those who want to become acquainted with the 'problems' of Oldgermanic grammar may turn to the books by the leaders in this branch of knowledge, who are naturally chiefly Germans: Kluge, Streitberg, and also, in order to mention a countryman, Boer (Tjeenk Willink). But the thorough and detailed study of Old Germanic grammar is not one to be taken up in spare moments, and students of the history of English, who have a longer road to travel than students of almost any other language, may be wise in not lingering too long at the beginning of their journey, for fear of never reaching their destination. I will only add, therefore, that an etymological dictionary for Gotic has been supplied by Professor Feist (Niemeyer, Halle). For the rest, Meillet's little book gives all the information of a bibliographical kind that the student can want.

The practical study of Old English or Anglo-Saxon has been treated in the chapter of the *Guide* referred to above. But the historical student should be acquainted with the standard grammars by Sievers and Bülbring as well as with the books mentioned there. Sievers is absolutely indispensable as a book of reference; and Bülbring's book, even though it appeared as long ago as 1901, is still the only complete history of O.E. sounds. In some

respects, however, Bülbring's book has been superseded: by the history of Old English vowels in Professor Luick's great *Historische Grammatik*, which is still incomplete. The parts that have appeared deal fully with every detail of the history of stressed and unstressed vowels in Old and Middle English. Luick's book, like other exhaustive books, may be considered rather exhausting reading for any reader who is not a German, but it will at any rate be found to be invaluable as a book of reference.

The learner who has read the selections in Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader* or any of the other books mentioned in the earlier chapter may turn to the second volume of Sweet's Reader, which gives the texts in other than West-Saxon dialects; but continental students may prefer to turn to the complete texts rather than to selections however excellent. It seems superfluous to mention any editions or even series of editions, such as Grein's *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie* and the *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, or the Early English Text Society; every possible piece of information is to be found in the section on *Angelsächsisch* by Professor Brandl in the third edition of Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, which was published in separate volumes. What has appeared since that time will be found in the annual bibliographies published by the *Berichte über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie*, published by Reisland (Leipzig). A few notes are to be found in the article in *English Studies* of October 1925 (p. 133 f.).

The study of Old English syntax is usually relegated into the background, a very unfortunate proceeding because it is at the very least as important for the future master as the study of forms and sounds. In fact, I am inclined to think that the study of Old English syntax is far more important. Its practical side has been dealt with in the April issue of this year.<sup>1)</sup> From a more scientific point of view I may add a few observations. In the first place it seems important to remember that some parts of Old English syntax are only to be looked upon as the last traces of the Old Germanic, or even Indogermanic, system; not as the beginnings of the English system of sentence-structure. From a syntactical point of view, indeed, we ought perhaps rather to speak of Anglo-Saxon than of Old English. Any one, for example, who wishes to study the Old English case-system can do so satisfactorily only if he compares it with the case-system of other Old Germanic languages, and a successful study of these entails a comparison of the syntax of other Indogermanic languages. The same applies to gender, word-order, and other subjects. The beginner will find an admirable guide in this field of study in Professor Sommer's *Syntax der Schulsprachen*,

<sup>1)</sup> By an oversight a specially useful French book has not been mentioned there: the first volume (all that has appeared up till now as far as I know) of the *Histoire de la langue anglaise* by Professor R. Huchon (Armand Collin, Paris. 1923). It contains a well-written chapter on Old English syntax which does not discourage the uninitiated reader by excess of technicality. As its title indicates, the book is an attempt at a complete history of the language, and the author deserves credit for his boldness. It must be added, however, that the first volume has met with some adverse criticism, notably by Professor Tolkien in the *Year's Work in English Studies*, and I believe, myself, that it does not give proof of such exact and deep scholarship as is necessary for a work of an authoritative and permanent character. In spite of this, the book will be found instructive, and, what is not so unimportant as some scholars are only too apt to think, pleasant reading. I am glad I have this early opportunity of correcting the omission in the April number, and will only point out, in partial excuse to the French reader who drew our attention to it, that M. Huchon's publisher has neglected to send a copy for review. But we agree that a periodical of the character of *English Studies* is the last where one could forgive the influence of 'nationalism'.

which first appeared in 1921 (Teubner) and has recently been reprinted without any important changes. It also contains a short bibliography, to which the second edition adds the admirable *Vorlesungen über Syntax* by Jacob Wackernagel (Basel, 1920 and 1924). In other cases, as in that of the tenses, it is quite possible to start with the Old English period; for there will be few scholars left at the present day who are still prepared to support the old theory revived by Meillet (in the *Caractères généraux* mentioned above), that the Old English perfect tenses are an imitation, or rather a translation, of the Vulgar Latin and Romance forms. The history of the infinitive, on the other hand, even if it can be treated perhaps from an exclusively English point of view, at any rate must be based on the idea of the infinitive as an oblique case of a verbal noun, and this basis is in reality supplied by Indo-germanic syntax. I have no wish to reopen the once hotly debated question whether we ought to speak of Anglo-Saxon or of Old English; but I believe the decision would not have been so preponderantly in favour of the term Old English if syntactical considerations had received the recognition that is due to them. And if Professor Legouis in his recent book on English literature, contrasting Old English literature and Chaucer's work, tries to show that Anglo-Saxon literature is an introduction to English literature rather than its first chapter, I believe a similar and perhaps equally strong case might be made out for the Anglo-Saxon language if contrasted with the language of London in Chaucer's time. Not that I clearly see the value of such a discussion; for in any case it will be difficult to decide where Anglo-Saxon stops, and English begins. It is perfectly easy to take a political date (the Conquest), as Professor Legouis does, but that is a different thing from showing or proving that the date is to be justified by the facts of the case.

The study of the middle period must now be considered. We assume, as before, that the student has a practical acquaintance with the texts of this period too, before he undertakes the systematic study of the history of English. The fullest information on all details concerning Middle English sounds will be found in Richard Jordan's recent book, the *Handbuch der Mittelenglischen Grammatik*, Volume, I, (Heidelberg, 1925). The book will unfortunately remain a torso, for the author died a few months after publication. In reality it is complete in so far as it deals exhaustively with Middle English sounds. The history of English vowels has been treated down to 1500 in the parts of Luick's book that have appeared up till now. It is important to note that Luick does not only describe the changes, but also tries to account for the phonetic character of the processes; this is a rare and valuable improvement upon the usual historical grammars. The middle period is also the time when the vocabulary of English was established on a new basis. We can say that henceforth English is a language with two strata; it is, of course, true enough that the language had adopted a great many loanwords from early times, but in this respect it does not differ from practically all languages of the world. The Latin borrowings in Old Germanic and in Old English times, and the Scandinavian elements introduced into the Old English vocabulary, however important they are, had not essentially modified the character of the language; the Scandinavian loanwords, indeed, were so similar in every respect that it is difficult, or even in cases impossible, for modern scholars to decide whether a word is a Scandinavian loanword or an original English word. But the French invasion in linguistic matters was very different: it introduced an enormous number of words that are even now, after many hundreds of years, felt to

be different. Hence the discussions, frequent in the nineteenth century, between the friends of plain Saxon words and those of a more Romanized style of English, traces of which are still to be discovered in such inventions as *foreword* for *preface*. The question is of course treated in general histories of English, but a real student should examine the matter also for himself. The best method is perhaps to read Old English, and to observe the cases that an Old English word has been replaced by a French one. A reference to Clark Hall's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* will enable a student to find out if the word still existed in the early Middle English period, and is, consequently, to be found in the Oxford Dictionary, and, most important, under what heading. This method of reading will show the student that the English vocabulary assumed its modern character in the course of the thirteenth century. In matters of syntax, the middle period is important on account of the loss of the old system of cases and the new wordorder, two peculiarities which are naturally connected with each other. The rise of new gender distinctions has been treated in a very suggestive speech, published afterwards in a somewhat enlarged form, by Lorenz Morsbach, *Grammatisches und Psychologisches Geschlecht im Englischen*, Berlin, 1913. There is no handbook on ME. syntax; a beginning was made long ago by Einenkel, *Streifzüge auf dem Gebiete der Mittelenglischen syntax* (1887), but the chief source of knowledge is still the grammar by Mätzner, printed for the third time in 1885.

The Middle English period is also important for a problem that has been much studied in the last half century: the rise of a standard form by the side of, and above, the local forms of speech. There was a beginning, no doubt, in the Old English period; but West-Saxon lost its hegemony when the Norman conquest destroyed the old structure of English society. The new political and intellectual centre, London, naturally became the home of the new standard language. This process has been fully studied by German scholars, in the first place by Morsbach and his pupils, who have published most of their work in the *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, of which Morsbach is the founder and general editor (Halle, Niemeyer).

As far as the sound system is concerned, we should probably say that Middle English is more like Old English than like the English of the present day. The great vowel-shift, as it has been called, did not begin till the fifteenth century, and continued down to the eighteenth century. Of course, there have been changes since that date, for no real spoken language ever stands completely still, but the later changes of sound have not been very great. The history of English sounds has been studied by two great English scholars, Ellis (*On Early English Pronunciation*) and Sweet (*History of English Sounds*). Both books are now somewhat antiquated, naturally. The best handbooks for students at present are the little Göschen volume by Ekwall (*Historische Neu-englische laut- und formenlehre*) and the fuller treatment by Jespersen in the first volume of his *Modern English Grammar*. The *Historische Neuenglische Grammatik* by Wilhelm Horn, Volume I, on the history of sounds since the Middle English period is out of print, and a new edition has been promised for some years. The student should also consult the *History of Modern Colloquial English* by Wyld, and Zachrisson's book on *The Pronunciation of English Vowels*. The morphology of the modern period has not been treated as a whole; a treatment is promised in the second volume of Horn's and Luick's books. For the history of modern English syntax the student will consult the *Shakespeare Grammatik* by Professor Franz, and the grammar of Mätzner; of course also the notes

on the subject in the second volume of Sweet's *Grammar*, and in the volume on syntax of Jespersen's *Grammar*.

After thus studying the history of English in some detail the learner feels the need of summing up and rounding off the knowledge gained in a general review of all the periods, in which the meaning of the changes described and their inter-relation can be discussed more fully, and, what is still more important, their meaning from the standpoint of language in general. The best book for this purpose seems to me the late Henry Bradley's little book on the *Making of English*. It is very popular in its tone, naturally, for the English public has not yet been persuaded to look upon the study of language as a real science, and is only prepared to treat books upon the subject as a means of intellectual amusement in a serious scholar's times of leisure. But the book contains some results of independent thought, and is admirably suited to the needs of a beginner. It is a characteristic product of a scholar of one of "our ancient universities," and consequently a reader may occasionally be amused by the insular one-sidedness that is to be expected. This chauvinism is evidenced by the glorification of Modern English gender, in contrast to the "useless" systems of other languages. The funny part of this is that the author ignores the real facts of Modern English gender in the natural *spoken* English, which is surely by no means free from the complications caused by irrational feeling, as when it makes names of things masculine. The use of *shall* and *will* "rests on a very intelligible principle," and the Scotch and the Irish are pitied, because they find it difficult to master the system, unless they have enjoyed the blessing of an English public school education, of course. The idea that these backward nations, as well as the Americans, may not care to obey the English standard, clearly never occurred to the author. But it must be acknowledged that the note of Jingoism, although undoubtedly present, is far from obtrusive, and may indeed escape many ears, unless they listen very attentively. A book of a similar character is the *Growth and Structure of the English Language* by Professor Otto Jespersen. This author is the great eulogist of the English language. His praises seem to be really exaggerated, even to Englishmen, at least to some English linguists; for in the last volume of the *Year's Work in English Studies* Professor Tolkien, although acknowledging the value of Jespersen's book (which cannot indeed be doubted by any competent critic), calls the book 'a touch sentimental.' Of course, the explanation of Professor Jespersen's valuation of English is not to be found in chauvinism, nor is it a case of anglomania, as some readers might suspect: it is really more scientific, in that it is the natural consequence of the author's principles in estimating the value or the merits of various languages. These principles have first been advocated in the book on *Progress in Language*, which won for the author general recognition as one of the leading scholars in the general study of language as well as among students of English. And his subsequent publications have only contributed to strengthen this position. But real students have no respect for authority; to apply a word that was once spoken on the Elizabethan stage in a somewhat different sense, they are "nothing if not critical." One of the weak sides of Jespersen's theory has recently been pointed out in this periodical by Professor Van Wijk, in reviewing Jespersen's *Language* (see *English Studies*, vol. IV, p. 208). In this respect it is of some importance to consider the great influence of spelling on English pronunciation; a collection of such spelling-pronunciations has been published by the late Emil Köppel, in a little volume

published in the series *Quellen und Forschungen* (1901). When I added a considerable number of examples, in my review in the *Literaturblatt für Germanische und Romanische Philologie* (Vol. 26, col. 102 ff.), I pointed out that a complete collection of such cases is really impossible, not only because they are innumerable, but also because it is impossible to prove that a pronunciation has been prevented from changing owing to the spelling; and yet, it can be reasonably shown that this must be the case in hundreds, even thousands, of words. I believe that the 'artificiality' of English does not stop here, and that we can show that its syntax, too, is more of an artificial product, or of a product of art, than that of other languages of Europe<sup>1)</sup>. All this would be in complete agreement with the attitude of the normal Englishman towards his language. He is, indeed, unwilling to learn foreign languages, but it would be a mistake to suppose that this unwillingness proceeds from a love of his native language. On the contrary, the "liebe zur muttersprache", which one so frequently meets with in German books, and in German life as well, is really unknown in England. A man prefers to speak English because it enables him to express himself in the easiest, and perhaps also the most effective way: it is due to the ordinary Englishman's dislike of unprofitable intellectual labour, and his practical sense. This also explains why it is so rare in England to find educated people who use dialect in their home-circle; perhaps this does not exist at all. For it can only exist where there is an intimate, personal relation to language; and this is unintelligible to an ordinary Englishman: to him his language is a tool, nothing more and nothing less than a tool. This character of the English language may be compared with that of artificial world languages. English may in many respects be looked upon as a natural artificial language. In calling English an artificial language I may seem to some readers to be attempting to lower its standing. Apart from my conviction of the uselessness, indeed the absurdity, of such an attempt, I will add, therefore, that the view if accepted does not make English an inferior nor a superior language, but a radically different one from other languages. No personal valuation<sup>2)</sup> is implied in the characterisation. As an artificial language, English will have a good chance of becoming the most important world language; perhaps we may say that it is already the most important language of the sort, and will ever become more so in the future, as far as we can foresee or foretell it. It follows from all this that there are more reasons for linguists to study English than any other of the great languages in the present world. It is also clear that this study, in order to be fruitful, can never be too minute.

E. KRUISINGA.

## Notes and News.

**English Studies in Japan.** More than a hundred years ago Dutch was the only European language studied in Japan. Many patriot-scholars of this country put heart and soul into its study, in order that they might

<sup>1)</sup> Some points have been discussed in my *Taal en Maatschappij* (Kemink, 1909).

<sup>2)</sup> In spite of the really or apparently linguistic arguments used to defend such valuations I believe they are of no linguistic importance whatever.

acquaint themselves with Western studies and with the condition of things in Europe. There is put up in the study of the present writer a tablet with an inscription written by one of these pioneers in 1837, which runs: "STUDIEKAMER. De waterdruppel maakt den steen hol, niet met geweld, maar door er dikmals op te vallen". It is almost incredible what difficulties these men had to contend with owing to the scarcity of books. I know a man who possesses a copy of Kramers: *Kunstwoordenboek*, in which it is written that the owner of the book, when his house fell down in the great earthquake of 1855, was advised by his friends to part with the copy, which would enable him to re-build his house. A Dutch dictionary would be borrowed and copied by student after student. Things were no better when English came to take the place of Dutch about 1850, and many neatly-written MS. dictionaries and readers which are handed down to us testify how badly off our predecessors were in the way of books. With all these drawbacks, however, they managed to assimilate enough Western ideas to lead the country onward in the path of enlightenment.

In 1853, the doors of Japan were thrown open to the outside world by a knock of Commodore Perry, though now his country is closing *her* doors upon us. From the 'sixties onwards, many of our countrymen went over to Europe and America either for study or for inspection, and many Europeans and Americans came to this country to guide and instruct us in Western arts and sciences.

Thus English was the language in which the older generation among us were taught various subjects, but this state of things naturally came to an end with the growing importance of the mother-tongue. To-day English is taught as a compulsory subject in all secondary schools (age 12-15), 5 to 7 hours a week being devoted to it, and it is continued in High Schools, or more properly, Colleges (age 16-18), i.e. preparatory to Universities. In recent years, English has been taken up in a few primary schools (age 6-11), but the results still remain to be seen. In spite, however, of all the time and labour expended in teaching and learning English, its efficiency is often called into question, especially on its practical side. This is chiefly due to the inadequate supply of competent teachers which could not cope with the enormous increase of Secondary and High Schools and also to the undue importance attached in these schools to translation into Japanese at the expense of speaking and writing. But the signs are that these are coming into their own and as for pronunciation there has been a marked improvement since the introduction ten years ago of the International Phonetic Alphabet, which may now almost be said to be in general use, though it may be doubted whether phonetics in incompetent hands would not do more harm than good. In this connexion the efforts of Mr. H. E. Palmer, of 'Spoken English' fame, who came here 4 years ago, must be acknowledged. Anyhow, the spread of English in Japan is such that there are about 20 monthly magazines connected with its study and the three broadcasting stations are devoting 40 minutes every evening to courses of lectures on English Language and Literature.

As to Universities, there are six Government, i.e. 'Imperial' Universities (to say nothing of private universities), of which Tokyo is the oldest and provided with two chairs of English Language and Literature. The other Universities, except Hokkaidō, have each a Professorship of English Literature. By far the greatest number of students flock to Tokyo, to enjoy the benefits (and also dangers) of metropolitan life, and at present there are

more than 120 students in the English Department. A certain number of ladies are allowed as 'hearers', but they are not entitled to receive 'degrees'. The graduating students are required to write theses in English and their interest is mainly literary, preference being given to modern authors.

A word about English Philology. It was Prof. John Lawrence (1850-1916) who came to Tokyo in 1906 and whose bent was decidedly philological, that first introduced us to a scientific study of English. After his death the present writer succeeded him as the first *native* Professor of English, and is working along the same lines. Now besides myself and another native Professor of English Literature, we have Mr. Edmund Blunden, and the Tōhoku University (at Sendai) boasts Mr. Ralph Hodgson, both of whom, besides being poets of high quality, are excellent and inspiring lecturers. There is also an annual publication called *English Studies*, compiled and edited by the Department of English. It first appeared in 1920 and from the current year it is going to be published quarterly under the joint editorship of the English Departments of the five Imperial Universities (Tōkyō, Kyōto, Tōhoku, Kyūshū and Chōsen). Each number will contain one or two articles in English and the first number of the New Series is due in April.

In conclusion I may mention that the Library of the Tokyo University and that of the English Seminar which were burnt down in the earthquake-fire of 1923, are likely to become better equipped than before, thanks to the sympathy and help of the whole world.

Tokyo.

SANKI ICHIKAWA.

---

**F. P. H. Prick van Wely †.** English lexicography has suffered a serious loss through the death of Dr. F. P. H. Prick van Wely, who died at Nijmegen on June 18. He devoted the better part of a lifetime to the improvement of Dutch-English dictionaries, and contributed articles on lexical and allied subjects to *English Studies* and other periodicals. In 1924 he was appointed Assistant in English at the R. C. University of Nijmegen.

---

**English Association in Holland.** The Annual Meeting of the General Committee was held at Utrecht on May 30<sup>th</sup>. The Committee accepted the resignations of Miss F. J. Quanjer as Hon. Secretary, and of Miss A. G. Kuipers as Assistant Secretary. In their place Mr. C. Bakker, Hilversum, was elected General Hon. Secretary.

Professor Dr. J. H. Kern was re-elected President, Mr. W. J. Smies Hon. Treasurer.

---

A new branch has been formed at Amersfoort. Hon. Sec. Miss H. C. W. Reese, Jan Steenstraat 16.

## Reviews.

HAROLD E. PALMER, *The Oral Method of Teaching Languages*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Impr., 1923. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

" " and DOROTHÉE PALMER, *English through Actions*, 1925. Tokyo, The Institute for Research in English Teaching.

" " *Colloquial English. Part I. 100 Substitution Tables*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edit., 1923. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

" " *English Intonation with Systematic Exercises*, 1922. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

" " *Everyday Sentences in Spoken English*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edit., 1923. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

" " *A Grammar of Spoken English on a Strictly Phonetic Basis*, 1924. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

Mr. HAROLD E. PALMER, formerly lecturer in Spoken English, University College, London, now Linguistic Adviser to the Japanese Department of Education, makes the impression of being a very good teacher, who has given much thought to the work that has occupied so many years of his useful life. He has had time and experience enough to know that there is more than one way of teaching a language, that there are many 'lines of approach', and that it depends very much upon the teacher and upon the pupil which line should be followed with the greatest chance of success. He sees quite clearly that a certain method — which he himself might prefer — cannot be followed by teachers who are not in possession of qualities which are absolutely necessary for this particular sort of teaching. He, therefore, points out more ways than one, an excellent thing for a linguistic adviser in matters of education. An extremist would be entirely out of place in so responsible a position.

Mr. Palmer shows his great teaching capacity also by the way in which he divides and sub-divides his subject matter. We see that he has thought it all out and that he knows what he is doing and speaking about. His mental property has been arranged in perfect order so that he can find every item of it whenever he wants it. He is so systematic that we are sometimes inclined to think that this faculty is running away with its master (see for example *English through Actions* pp. XV—XVIII, Types of Stimulus and Reaction), but that is only the "too much" of an excellent quality. Isn't it perfectly true that we show understanding as soon as we begin to discern and to classify?

We have to judge Mr. Palmer's works from the teacher's point of view, not from the scientific. It seems to me that that is what he himself principally lays claim to. Not but that he is desirous to form a sound psychological basis for his views, but what he wants to do in the first place is to show teachers how to teach and what they should teach their pupils.

The author concerns himself only with modern English, especially with what he calls "Spoken English". It is a difficult thing to say what this is

though the writer tells us in his introduction to *A Grammar of Spoken English* what he understands by it. Is it really only what is used in general conversation about topics of the day? When educated people are engaged in serious conversation about important subjects, when they explain difficulties to those who are really interested and eager to know every detail, do they make use of "Literary English"? Does the author not make use of Spoken English when he writes his deeply considered dedicatory prefaces and introductions, general or other? It seems to me that we should not confine Spoken English to the English that is used in general, often very superficial, conversation only. We have to think not only of the figure our pupil will make in common conversation but also of the development of his mind, and so we have to consider what mental food we should place before him.

*The Oral Method of Teaching Languages*, with its sub-title: *A Monograph on Conversational Methods together with a full description and Abundant Examples of fifty appropriate Forms of Work* is in two parts. In the first part the writer has set forth in an excellent manner the advantages he finds in oral work. A quotation taken from Prof. Jespersen's *How to Teach a Foreign Language* is given by way of motto. Here it is. "As a bright contrast to the 'constructive' method of procedure, we have the 'imitative' 'method, which may be so called partly because it is an imitation of the 'way in which a child learns his native language, partly because it depends upon that invaluable faculty, the natural imitative instinct of the pupils, 'to give them the proper linguistic feeling, if it only has ample opportunities 'for coming into play.'" But our pupils are no longer children as a rule and naturally want to make use of everything they have already learned, chief among which is their native language, which is associated with everything they have experienced, with all their joys and sorrows. I once asked a little child who was taught after the oral method, what he thought when the teacher pointed to the stove and said "stove, stove." The answer was, "I thought that is what we call *kachel*" (*kachel* is the Dutch for stove). It is an illusion to suppose that in learning a foreign language the pupil's native speech can be eliminated. Does not the writer himself say on p. 47: "He (the pupil) must also be warned definitely and repeatedly against 'mentally translating into his own language what he hears'. Of course; he is tied to his native tongue like one Siamese twin to the other.

And where are the *ample opportunities* for bringing the *linguistic feeling of the pupil* into play? A child opens his mouth and begins to speak his native language as soon as he is awake in the morning, and he hears it and uses it till he falls asleep in the evening. Our Dutch pupils who want to or rather have to learn English get four lessons a week at most — private pupils often have to be satisfied with one only — while during the rest of the week, with the exception of the time they have to give to other foreign languages, they speak and hear Dutch. For pupils such as we usually have the oral method, which has to go on leisurely, takes too much time.

A second objection to the use of the oral method as Mr. Palmer wants to apply it is the large number of pupils we have in our schoolclasses. In speaking of one of the advantages of 'Receptive Work' (p. 41), the writer says: "There is no limit to the number of students who may participate in it. For ordinary question and answer work a class should not consist of more than twelve students (unless recourse is had to chorus work); for normal conversation, in the generally accepted sense of the word, the

"class should not consist of more than four students at the outside. But "most forms of Receptive Work can be carried on just as easily with a "hundred students as with one. Indeed, the teacher will find it easier and "far more interesting to talk to a large class, for he will feel that at least "a few of the students understand everything he says." But we cannot have a class of 100 students at one moment and of 12 at the other. Twelve! Two fifths of thirty! I can see the wistful glance in the eyes of the teachers in our country.

Mr. Palmer calls himself a 'keen phonetician', as, indeed, he confidently may. Not being a fanatic, he is fully conscious that in teaching his pupils he must deviate in some respect from the oral method if he wants to make use of phonetics. So he says (pp. 33-34.) "Those whom we have quoted "as the stoutest protagonists of the oral method do not advocate blindly "and fanatically the exclusion of any forms whatsoever of the non-oral "medium, even during the early stages." And on p. 33 we find, "It is also "held by our leading authorities that an extensive use should be made of "phonetic symbols, more especially during the first stage; even if only on "the ground that ear-training exercises cannot be carried out without the "use of those symbols. The phonetician may therefore hold that any procedure "which excludes the use of symbols and transcription is a wrong procedure."

But what is the use of 'symbols' if the pupils do not know what they stand for? The sounds they indicate differ more or less from those they are accustomed to use in their mother tongue, the manner of intonation is not the same as their own. All this must be explained to them, which can be done *only* in their native language. The teacher may talk as much as he likes, he will produce little effect on most of his pupils if he does not draw their attention to what distinguishes the foreign sound from the corresponding native one and to the change in the position of the organs of speech which is necessary for its production. Does not a Scotchman who was educated in Scotland among Scotchmen and came to live in London, say in his twentieth year, retain to the end of his life some of the peculiarities of his native speech if he is not possessed of a particularly fine musical ear and a special desire of conforming his speech to that of the people among whom he moves? How then can we expect children who remain in their own country to acquire a somewhat correct pronunciation of a foreign language if we do not put all our knowledge of phonetics to practical use? And I repeat emphatically that this cannot be done if we eliminate the pupil's mother tongue.

The author himself has, fortunately, no mortal (morbid?) fear of using the pupil's native speech. He says, among others, on p. 62: "Should the "student not understand the meaning of a given sentence, an appropriate "explanation should be given him either by *translating* it or by paraphrasing "it in simpler terms." He does not, however, insist enough upon the occasional *necessity* of it.

The second book on my list, *English through Actions*, is the outcome of Mr. Palmer's desire to write a 'Teacher's Book' with reference to a 'Complete Standard course of English composed specially for use in Japanese schools'. Of the many 'lines of approach' (Pronunciation Line of Approach, Reader Line of Approach, Contextual Line of Approach, etc.) it concerns itself with one only, the 'Oral Ostensive Line'. On p. VI of the 'General Introduction' we read: "I began to perceive that the two types of oral "work that I had designated respectively by the terms 'Ostensive' and

"Contextual" (see *Oral Method of Teaching Languages* pp. 73-74) are difficult to combine in one single book. Each of these types of work requires "the frequent use of the mother tongue of the pupils<sup>1)</sup> and this consideration places it beyond the bounds of the Direct Method proper, and would involve difficulties in the case of the foreign teacher ignorant of Japanese.

"I therefore eliminated from the groups of Conventional Conversation all "those which could not be immediately demonstrated by the use of objects "and actions, and for the first time I recognised the Ostensive as a Line "of Approach in itself, the rejected Contextual groups to form a separate "and independent Line of Approach."

We see from this that in *English through Actions* English is taught by showing (Lat. ostendere = to show) actions and objects, drawing attention to their performance or non-performance, their performers, to the various qualities of the objects, to place, time, number, etc. and giving or asking the English word or expression while doing so.

The book is divided into five sections: 1. Collective Imperative Drill, 2. Individual Imperative Drill, 3. Conventional Conversation, 4. Free Oral Assimilation, and 5. Action Chains. For two of these sections, the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Palmer's daughter is particularly responsible; it is for this reason that her name appears on the title page as her father's collaborator. We can only congratulate both daughter and father.

Each of these 'booklets' contains ample material and numerous examples, to my taste too ample and too numerous. The advantage is that those who want to teach according to the method demonstrated here, cannot possibly be mistaken. Foreigners can only be thankful for the fulness of detail on account of the number of words and expressions that are given.

Let me mention here that Mr. Palmer has written some Pupils' Textbooks for the "Institute of Research in English Teaching" at Tokyo. I have before me *Book One (Part One)*, *Book One (Part Two)* — these two also in one volume — *Book Two (Part One)* of the *Standard English Readers*. The 'Phonetic Edition' of *Book I (Part I)* has already appeared too. These books are carefully graded, also with reference to grammar. Then there is *English through Questions and Answers*, corresponding to *Book I (Part I)* and *Graded Exercises in English Composition*, corresponding to *Book I (Part II)* of the Readers. Other textbooks are to follow. This gives us some idea of the importance that is attached in Japan to the study of English and of what is done by the State to promote it.

In *Colloquial English, Part I* (has the second part, 'Progressive Exercises in Colloquial English' [see Introduction p. XIII] ever been published?), *100 Substitution Tables*, Mr. Palmer has worked out one of his pet ideas. He gives typical English sentences, divides them into their component parts, and writes in a column under each of these parts words that may be substituted for those at the top. In a long introduction he explains what 'substitution' is (Intr. p. III): "Substitution may be described as the "process by which any authentic sentence (as opposed to one constructed, "perhaps faultily, by the student himself) may be multiplied indefinitely by "substituting for any of its words or word-groups others of the same "grammatical family and within certain semantic limits."

Let me give an example (see Intr. V).

<sup>1)</sup> The Italics are mine.

I	saw	two	books	here	yesterday.
You	put	three	letters	there	last week.
We	left	a few	keys	on the table	on Sunday.
They	found	some	good ones	in this box	this morning.

This gives the following sentences:

*I* saw two books here yesterday.

*You* saw two books here yesterday.

*We* saw two books here yesterday.

*They* saw two books here yesterday.

*I put* two books here yesterday.

*I left* two books here yesterday, and so on, and so on *ad infinitum*, no, that is not true. The writer says that this substitution table will yield 4096 perfectly rational sentences. To be honest, I have not verified this statement.

The writer has taken infinite pains about his subject, carefully selecting his *authentic* sentences and to some extent grading his 'tables'. He lays some stress upon this, saying (Intr. p. V): "Although the composition of a 'few isolated *simple* tables requires neither linguistic knowledge nor experience, 'the construction of a *series* of *compound* tables with a high yield of rational 'and useful sentences without any important omissions nor (or?) transgressions against the 'principle of frequency' is no easy matter. The series 'forming the subject of the present book is the outcome of a long period 'of work and of tentative experiments."

He has also taken the trouble of giving the 'substitution tables' in two forms. In the first half of the book we have them in a phonetic transcription with the chief stresses marked, which certainly enhances their value, in the second part they are given in the usual orthography.

I see the advantages of the use of the substitution tables which the author enumerates on pp. V–VI of the Introduction, but there are two important drawbacks. I should be heartily sick of each of the substitution tables before I had formed all the sentences which can be made with their help. The work would be too mechanical for me, and though I am in favour of mechanising, by which the author sets great store, our pupils can obtain fluency and perfection in speech by less tedious and more attractive means. The second drawback is that there is a danger of giving quite unusual if not altogether wrong sentences, which even our painstaking author has not escaped. What about sentences like these, which I take from the second part of the book: *Yes, I never do it; Oh yes, we hardly ever go to London* (Table 1, p. 53); *I wrote a small one against mine; There is a smaller one through yours* (Table 51, p. 78), *They are lost every fortnight*. When I saw them in going through the book, I thought within myself, "I am very glad that Mr. Palmer himself has not taken the trouble of 'forming all the sentences his 'tables' can yield. He has saved much 'valuable time by this.'

The best book Mr. Palmer has, in my opinion, written is *English Intonation with Systematic Exercises*. This is an excellent book indeed and most useful to any student of English. We all know that the intonation of French and Swedish for instance is different from that of English and Dutch, and on our first visit to a foreign country we notice a certain

difference in the way of speaking between us and the inhabitants of the country; but most people soon get accustomed to this and go on talking the foreign language in their own way. Only a few who are specially gifted, unconsciously use the same tones in all their variety which the natives use, and may rightly be said to speak the foreign language well.

In an excellent preface and introduction the author tells us what intonation is and shows us that it forms an inseparable and most important part of any language. He then proceeds to make us see that English speech is cut up in 'Tone-Groups' (a 'Tone-Group' being defined as "a word or 'series of words in connected speech containing one and only one maximum of prominence" and that each Tone-Group contains a *Nucleus*, which is the stressed syllable of the most prominent word in the Tone-Group, in fact the syllable with *sentence-stress*).

In the following section he speaks of the four characteristic 'Nucleus Tones': the Falling (which may be Intensified), the High-Rising, the Falling-Rising, and the Low Rising and gives the signs by which he marks them, very simple and expressive. Then he gives five instances of each of these *nuclei*.

The Nucleus of a Tone-Group is in most instances followed by a 'Tail' of one, two, and three or more syllables, as *never, I like it* (the stress falling upon *I*), *everybody*, etc., the way of intoning them being marked by the five signs for the Nucleus-Tones placed before the Tone-Group and by dots (a big one for the stressed syllable) after it, placed so as to indicate the various pitch of each tone. When the tone of a syllable glides upwards and so has a lower beginning and a higher end, the dot is replaced by a small sloping line. This ingenious method makes it very easy for the student to imitate the given intonation. In an exceedingly good selection of typical instances an example is found for each particular case.

Next come the various 'Heads', any syllable or syllables preceding the nucleus in the same tone-group being termed the Head of the group. They are divided into Inferior, Superior, Scendent, and Heterogeneous and are indicated by small lines, horizontal for the inferior and superior heads, sloping upward for the scendent. The lower or higher place of this line indicates the pitch of the tone. For each of the possible combinations of *head, nucleus, and tail* in each of the five tone-groups a carefully selected example is given.

In Section X the writer gives the 'Semantic functions of the tone-groups' telling us what is meant by the intonations he has explained to us. The science being new yet, he does this in a tentative way, knowing very well that a variety of intonations may express the same or nearly the same thing.

A sentence may contain one, two, or more nuclei and consequently as many tone-groups. Any pair or more of tone-groups in any one sentence (simple or compound) constitutes a 'tone-sequence' (see p. 87). Section XI treats of the sequences of tone-groups and tries to set forth under what circumstances various combinations may be expected.

All the examples throughout the book are written in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, and the book closes with a few phonetic texts in *tonetic*<sup>1)</sup> transcription.

I have gone through this book, reading the examples aloud, four times at least, conscientiously imitating the way of intoning the writer has pointed out, and I intend doing so every now and then. Each successive time I

<sup>1)</sup> What phonetics does for speech-sounds, 'tonetics' does for speech-tones (p. 3).

detect some difference between my intonation of English and Mr. Palmer's, and I feel that I shall be on sure ground when I have abandoned my way for his. I do hope that a new edition will soon be called for, as *English Intonation* deserves a large number of readers, and a few misprints, almost unavoidable in a book of this kind, demand correction.

The author dedicates his book to his friend and colleague, H. O. Coleman, whose *Intonation and Emphasis*, International Phonetic Association, I have got possession of through the kindness of Professor Daniel Jones, but whose article, *The Kind of English I use in Ordinary Conversation*, from which (see p. 105) the third 'phonetic text' was taken, has never been printed, which is a great pity. He also mentions Professor Daniel Jones and H. Klinghardt but does not give the name of Henry Sweet, whose *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*, preceding and even excelling his *Primer of Spoken English* (from which the two other 'phonetic texts' were adapted) roused the greatest enthusiasm within me. He may have simply been a forerunner, but what a forerunner!

The full title of the following book on my list is *Everyday Sentences in Spoken English In Phonetic Transcription with Intonation Marks (For the use of Foreign Students)*, which tells us a great deal about the contents and makes us, foreigners, eager to be acquainted with it.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Palmer has made use of too dark colours in sketching on the first two pages of his preface the unhappy foreigner during his first stay in England. If I were not a Dutchman myself, I should feel bound to say that our Dutch pupils who have been taught for some time by a competent teacher (not a competent *English* teacher with a thorough knowledge of our native language because then it would be quite impossible) cannot cut such a miserable figure as the preface puts before us. Of course they will make mistakes, they will miss the necessary fluency, but they have been taught to express themselves tolerably well, and they will make a thankful use of Mr. Palmer's book to correct their mistakes and improve their fluency.

The book consists of four parts. The first part gives "easy laconic expressions." This should not have been put first, because it is by far the most difficult and will deter any student who is not well up in English. He does not know under what circumstances he has to use the various intonations given because the context is wanting and he cannot feel interested in all these short expressions placed in such a small compass, which only bewilder him. This part is fit for the serious and advanced student of English only.

The second part, containing "typical everyday sentences" is exceedingly good. If Mr. Palmer would extend this into a book by itself, giving all the principal subjects we have to talk about in England, he would be sure of one thankful student, nay, judging others by myself, of thousands and thousands of them.

The third part, "Methods of Expression", arranged under various heads such as *How to express thanks*, *What to say on receiving a gift etc.*, *What to say when introducing people to each other*, etc. is too systematic to attract the general student of English but contains excellent exercises for the teacher. Take for example pp. 28-30, which is fitly called 'a study in intonation'. For *How to Ask Somebody to do Something* (in this case to come here) 71 various intonations and expressions are given. I do not know whether French or Japanese students are more patient and painstaking than those of our country. The average Dutch student would stop

'asking somebody to come here' long before he had gone half through the list, though the list itself as well as all those that follow and precede it is beyond reproach and far above my praise.

The fourth part consists of "a series of Tables by means of which many thousands of simple and current English sentences may be composed with the minimum of conscious effort". These tables are in the nature of the 'substitution tables', the usefulness of which is, to me, problematic.

*A Grammar of Spoken English*<sup>1)</sup> is in many respects a very refreshing book. Mr. Palmer does not consider *grammar* as something sacred, as a collection of rules to which a language has to conform, on the contrary, he takes a language as it is and writes his grammar in conformity with it. He does not say: *It is me* is wrong; it should be *It is I*, because *I* is used predicatively and should have the form of the nominative, no, he is fully aware of the fact that a living language is changing continually and what is considered wrong now, may be good grammar after some time. He rightly laughs at educated people moving in good society who condemn the use of *who* for *whom* in *Who has it been done by?* and unconsciously use the expression the next moment. If it was only for this reason *A Grammar of Spoken English* would be well worth studying. But there is more. The author confines himself strictly to Spoken English, to "that variety of English which is generally used by educated people (more especially in the South of England) in the course of ordinary conversation or when writing letters to intimate friends" (Intr. p. XXXI). (Simple and familiar letters are meant here, of course, not other kinds, which may also be written to intimate friends.) This has its great use in teaching the student what is correct in spoken, colloquial, or everyday English though it may be quite unusual, and therefore wrong, in written, classical or literary English. *Correct usage* in spoken English is the author's guide throughout the book.

At the end of a long and interesting introduction, in which many of the author's views are explained, he tells us that he intends to treat the various classes of grammatical phenomena under the following headings:

1. *Phonetics*, including the study of sounds, sound attributes (length, stress, and intonation), and *weakening*.
2. *Parts of Speech*, their morphological and syntactical uses.
3. *Parts of the Sentence*, or the syntax of the sentence.
4. *Certain Logical Categories*, which cannot be treated under the foregoing three headings.

Part I is very short and contains a brief survey of the various English sounds, simply cataloguing them and giving their phonetic symbols; a few remarks about *length* and *stress* (the author prefers the word *syllable-stress* to *word-stress*); a useful list of characteristic examples of assimilation in Spoken English, something about *plosives* and *explosions*; four pages about *weakening*, which give a great many things very useful for foreigners to know and frequently unnoticed if the attention is not expressly drawn to them (my own eyes were opened to an incorrectness I had thousands of times been guilty of), the rest treating of intonation and giving the same matter without the examples as we find in the separate book on 'English Intonation', which I have already spoken of.

In Part II Mr. Palmer's power of classification, of dividing and subdividing, comes out to its fullest extent. The classification differs in some

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. also E. S. VII, pp. 56 ff. (April 1925) — Ed.

respects from that usually found in our grammarbooks, and here and there we find a new name, but a new path is rarely shown. We are specially interested in those paragraphs which make it evident that we have a grammar of Spoken English before us. Take for example p. 59, § 140, in which the rule is given for the use of *much* and *many*, and we are told that, with the exception of five cases enumerated, they are almost invariably replaced by *a lot*, *a large number*, *a large quantity*, *plenty*, *a good deal*, etc. See also the emphatic and weak forms of the anomalous verbs, §§ 217-263 and the remark about the use of *right* and *just* as modifiers before preposition-like adverbs, as *right in* and *just in*.

We find extensive lists of *nouns*, *adjectives*, *verbs*, *adverbs*, which are useful to us because we see from them what words and expressions are generally used in Spoken English and — all examples being given in phonetic writing with stress-marks and intonation-marks — how the author pronounces them. When full lists are given, we are inclined to look at them critically and to ask, for example, why in the 'List of Commonest Verbs of the Dead Conjugation' (§ 216) *to burn*, *to deal*, *to gild*, *to kneel*, *to knit*, *to lean*, *to leap*, *to learn*, *to mow*, and *to set* are not given. Are these words rarely used in Spoken English? It is interesting to read in the foot-note on p. 98 that *lain* (the past participle of *to lie*) is "practically unknown in Spoken English". It is a good thing to have our attention drawn to such matters.

In many cases we should have liked an explanation or, if possible, a rule. Take for instance § 443, where we read: "When interrogative words 'are used with prepositions, the preposition is usually placed at the end of the sentence . . . . . But occasionally the preposition precedes the 'interrogative word: *At what time did you go?* *On what day did he come?* *In what year was that?* *By what means did he overcome the difficulty?*' Is this a question of usage only?

Part III, treating of the various parts of the sentence and of the order in which they are placed, opens with 12 'tables' containing examples of the usual arrangements. It has evidently been the author's purpose simply to make us see, systematically ordered, what sentences are commonly used in Spoken English. Explanations are not given, things are only stated, generally, as in the case of the 'Adverbals', with fulness of detail.

In Part IV, 'Logical Categories', the writer places whatever does not lend itself to treatment under the respective headings of 'Parts of Speech' and 'Parts of the Sentence'. Much of what is said here is very instructive and forms a useful supplement to what is generally found in our grammars, especially those paragraphs which refer to intonation. Part of the matter treated here is also found in *English Intonation* and in *Everyday Sentences in Spoken English*, but with very few exceptions (see for example §§ 638 and 639) it is given in a different arrangement and seen in another light.

It would require too much space to point out the many good things in this section. Let me say in conclusion that in my opinion every teacher and advanced student of English, not only every *foreign* teacher and student, should read and study Mr. Palmer's 'Grammar of Spoken English'. It will certainly make them see things they had not noticed before and which are necessary for a complete knowledge of the language.

*English Place Names in -ing.* By EILERT EKWALL. (Skrifter utgivna av kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. VI) Lund, London, Oxford, Paris & Leipzig, 1923.

A complete investigation of the place-names in *-ing* is only possible if based upon English material, the origin and the various uses of the ending being nowhere else so clear and transparent as on English territory. Though an expert in place-name research, the French historian A. Longnon committed the blunder of denying the existence of *-ing* with the value of a patronymic<sup>1)</sup>. All those tempted to take such extreme views ought to read Prof. Ekwall's book. It will show them the extreme intricacy of the *-ing* problem and teach them by his example how circumspect they must be when dealing with such delicate problems.

All possible kinds of *-ing* names are found in England. I. A frequent type is the singular in *-ing*: *Bletching* (-court), *Charing*, *Bocking*, *Thurning*, etc. Some seem to designate "streams, forests and the like" rather than villages. On the other hand, though bearing resemblance to similar formations in other Germanic countries, their origin is generally far from clear. This is not surprising, for anyone reading the paragraphs concerning *-ing*, *-ung* in Klug's *Stammbildung* will be struck by the fact that many of the formations mentioned there are hopelessly obscure. But on the other hand it is evident that *-ing* can be considered in many cases as an adjective ending meaning "belonging to". The patronymic sense "son of" is simply a particular instance of the general sense of ownership. In Russian the ending *-ov* has a similar sense: *Markov dom* means Mark's house and *Maryya Markova dotch* means Mary, daughter of Mark — though this expression is nowadays avoided as unrefined (the usual patronymic being *Maryya Markovna*), the numerous surnames in *-ov* show that it was once quite normal. Prof. Ekwall seems rather embarrassed by such place-names as *Gimming*, *Bleccing*, which are certainly derived from personal names. He is quite right in keeping this group apart from the names in *-ingas* (plural). But I cannot see why even a forest, a stream, a small hamlet, etc., could not be named after a man, even if that man was not the owner or occupant. *Gimming* may be the place where Gimma lives or related in some sense to Gimma, famous by the legend of Gimma, etc. Of course this is no explanation. But the fact that the names in *-ingas*, also derivatives from personal names, represent a very different type must not induce the scholar to bring under one head all the *-ings* that point to personal names. And the author is quite justified in observing that *Bleccing denn* is not necessarily *Blecca's den* but may be the "den called Bleccing".

II. Common nouns in *-ing* (p. 23—26) belong to well-known types. It may be observed that the sharp distinction which scholars usually make between abstract and concrete is never found to exist in real language when actually put to the test. "The ending *-ingō* frequently formed abstract nouns. Many of these acquired a concrete meaning and came to be used in a topographical sense" says Prof. Ekwall. I should like to know how one is to prove that O.E. *fælging* meant first the abstract fallowness and afterwards a fallow land. Even educated peasants of to-day would have some difficulty to grasp the distinction. In fact some suffixes can be used to form abstract nouns, whereas the majority occur only in the concrete sense. But even the abstract ones have frequently a concrete meaning.

<sup>1)</sup> *Les noms de lieux de la France*, p. 175-176

III. Names in *-ing* from earlier *-in* or *-en* are of very different origin. Some have probably *-unniō*, as *birkin*.

IV. Old compounds with *eng*, meadow, *hlinc* link, hill, *hring* or *ping* can account for only a few *-ing* names.

In Chapter II the author deals with the names in *-ingas*. His conclusion about these, as summed up p. 103f. is very explicit. (1) The greater number are derived from personal names. (2) A few from the name of a river or other topographical names. (3) No other type of derivation can be proved to occur. As to (1) dithematic compounds are very scantily represented, *-ing* being chiefly added to hypocoristics or nick-names. The former show derivative suffixes in *l*, in *s* and sometimes in *n* and *r*. I may be allowed to point to the extraordinary resemblance of the treatment of *-ing* derivatives in English and Old Dutch (see *O. G. Naamk.* p. 215f.).

I am unable to discuss the author's theory concerning the distribution of the *-ingas* names which he takes to be witnesses of the earliest settlements. According to him the meaning "descendant of" does not apply in the case of names denoting a district of large extent. The last argument cannot be considered decisive. The fact that the name of a larger district is of the same type as that of a village community can be explained in various ways and what was the name of a large area in the IX<sup>th</sup>, X<sup>th</sup> or even XI<sup>th</sup> century may have been the name of a village a few centuries earlier. The topographical information of early mediæval scribes is often fanciful, at least on the continent; it is frequently difficult to identify their geographical designations because of the impossibility of giving a definite sense to the terms *province*, *pagus*, *district*, as used by them.

As to age, distribution and etymology the *-ingham* names stand on one line with the *-ingas* ones. Of course, the author is extremely cautious when making such statements, which necessarily bear a provisional character. No example of interchange between *-ingas* and *-ingaham* seems to occur. In Flanders, where *-ingahem* is very frequent and *-inge(n)* much rarer, one instance is found, namely *Pupringahem* a<sup>o</sup> 877 (not orig.) now *Poperinge* (W. Fland.), *Poperinga* a<sup>o</sup> 1147. The personal name, from which *Popering* is a derivative, is far from clear.

One feels tempted to draw more general conclusions from the distribution of the *-ingham*, *-inghem*, etc., names in the different West Germanic countries. The author's conclusion is that whilst names of that type do not seem to have been popular with the Jutes and Saxons in England, they were much more in favour with the Anglians. The corresponding *-inghem* type in the Netherlands is generally considered to go back to early Frankish settlements. In Flanders it is far less represented in the coast districts than in the inland. If the coast Flemings are to be considered as Saxons, which is fairly certain for those living near Boulogne (see my paper *le Problème saxon*, *Bulletin du Musée belge* XXX [1926] p. 5—14), the relative rarity of *-inghem*'s in that Saxon land would tally remarkably with Prof. Ekwall's conclusion concerning England: *-inghem* names point to the non-Saxon character of a population. Even a merely negative conclusion as this goes perhaps too far. But it may contain a grain of truth and prove suggestive for further research.

The last chapter of Prof. Ekwall's book is devoted to the "palatalisation" in the *-ing* names, i. e. the pronunciation as *-inđge*. In the case of plural forms his explanation is very plausible. The names in *-ing*, originally *a*-stems, followed the analogy of the *i*-stems, the latter being frequent in the names of tribes and nations (as in *-hāeme*, *Engle*). The same phenomenon occurs in Frisian, where *Groningi* becomes *Greninze* and in numerous derivatives

in *-ingi* in other parts of Western Germany, which have been correctly explained by Förstermann as having adopted the *i*-declension. So far I concur with the author's opinion. As to the examples of the singular, the assumption of a locative ending *-i*, though possible, is less convincing. But I must confess that I have no other hypothesis to suggest.

It will be evident from what has been said how interesting and suggestive Prof. Ekwall's book will appear to all concerned with place-name research. The suffix *-ing* is found in all Germanic countries; it has been borrowed as *-ange* in Romance. The explanations attempted hitherto were all one-sided and based on insufficient material. Few investigators suspected the importance of the singular *-ing-* names or had clear notions about the respective age and distribution of *-ingas* and *-ingaham*. Prof. Ekwall's book is in all respects a momentous acquisition for toponymical science.

Liège.

JOS. MANSION.

*Exameron Anglice or The Old English Hexameron*. Edited with an Introduction, a Collation of all the manuscripts, a modern English translation, parallel passages from the other works of Ælfric and notes on the sources. By S. J. CRAWFORD, M. A., B. Litt., Professor of English Philology in the Madras Christian College. Hamburg. Henri Grand. 1921. (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa. Begründet von Ch. W. M. Grein, fortgesetzt von R. P. Wülker. Herausgegeben von Hans Hecht. Band X).

*König Alfreds des Grossen Bearbeitung der Soliloquien des Augustinus*. Herausgegeben von W. ENDTER. Ib. 1922. (Greins Bibliothek Band XI).

The character of the re-edition of the Hexameron is sufficiently indicated by the very full title-page which is reproduced above. The new edition is the result of work for the degree of B. Litt. by a pupil of the late Professor Napier. It has, no doubt, been very instructive for the student, and the result is also welcome to the outside public. It is unfortunately a very limited public that will care to read these sermons of Ælfric's; for that is what the book is, as is convincingly shown by the editor, and not what may have been suggested by the title to readers who are more familiar with the Decamerone, or even with the Heptameron, than with Old English Prose, the range of which is regrettably small. Even professed students of Old English will not get excited over this addition to their reading, and may even think of it as a duty to be faced (or put off!). Those who have learned to take an interest in the theology of the time will be specially grateful to the editor, both for his translation, which is hardly required by students of philology, and the liberal notes with parallel passages. There is naturally little of philological importance in the work, which had become more or less inaccessible, for the edition of H. W. Norman (1849) is found in some few libraries only. Some interest attaches to the glosses added by a Worcester monk about the year 1200, when the language of the text had come to be somewhat antiquated. Thus we find that *æt* (he ætes ne gymde) is glossed by *metes*; and *fnæst* (l. 132) by *eðme*; *gehet* (l. 149) by *cleopode*; *rodor* (l. 154) by *weolcen*; *cwyd* by *seid*, etc. I have twice found *odðe* 'corrected' to *odðer*; this seems a welcome addition to the evidence supplied by the Oxford Dictionary. The title-page indicates that Mr. Crawford

has obtained a post that may enable him to use his thorough knowledge of an earlier stage of his native language as a basis for further research, as well as in his professional work, so that we may hope to meet him again, sooner or later.

Dr. Endter's edition of the *Soliloquies* has been arranged according to the same method as the preceding. He has not supplied a translation, however, giving the Latin original instead. The introduction gives the history of the text and a bibliography of all that has been written about it. In the notes P. 71-97 many points both of grammar and of the interpretation of the text and the author's sources are discussed.

E. KRUISINGA.

---

*British Drama. An Historical Survey from the Beginnings to the Present Time.* By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. 500 pp. 8°. Harrap, 1925. 12/6.

One keeps reading chapters of this book, and marvelling at the author's power. He must have trebled himself and abjured sleep to get through so much work, and though the book is well proportioned and evenly worked, the later chapters are even fresher than the earlier part. We are fortunate in having this crowded continent mapped out for us clearly and yet in much detail. The author takes a democratic view of the stage, and shows a frank independence of judgment to which his high attainments entitle him.

Each of the six main divisions: Beginnings — Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline Drama — the Restoration period — Drama in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century — and The Revival in the Theatre (since Ibsen), is prefaced with a sketch of the theatrical craft and of the audiences of the period. To these physical and social conditions great importance is attached in accounting for changes in the general qualities of the plays in successive periods. As regards the early plays, down to the Jacobean period, their outer and inner growth have been analysed with precision by Pollard (*Miracle Plays*), Chambers (*Medieval Stage*), Lawrence and several others, dealing with the *Shakespearian Playhouse*, on which Chambers also gave us the monumental *Elizabethan Stage* (in four volumes, 1923). As to the Restoration drama Prof. Nicoll shares with Nettleton the honour of pioneering, but on the early 19<sup>th</sup> century stage there are no authoritative works, so that here Prof. Nicoll has done spadework, and done it so thoroughly that the reader is not conscious of treading fresh broken ground. The author's explanation of why the theatre rapidly decayed after Sheridan and Goldsmith must, I suppose, be regarded as tentative. Among the main factors tending to make the drama after 1780 ranting and bombastic Nicoll points to the hulking size (for commercial reasons) of the only two licensed play-houses of the period, Covent-Garden and Drury Lane. Actors had to make their inflections coarse; repartee, the effect of which sometimes depends on smooth casualness, had to be barked; the tender whisper or the muttered aside had to be shouted if the actors' voices were to carry to the topmost galleries and the pit. Scott and Joanna Baillie state that "the largeness of our two regular theatres, so unfavourable for hearing clearly, has changed in a great measure the character of the pieces exhibited." Hence only the loudest effects could be used, and spectacular melodrama, with tableaux and huge choruses came into vogue, to the decay of the drama proper. The too large theatres afforded chances for

disorderly elements among the audience to misbehave in various ways. If there had been more and smaller playhouses they could have sorted themselves out in different classes, and besides haunts of popular amusement, and of fashionable levity, there could have been a few decent playhouses devoted to serious drama and healthy comedy. Southey, Landor, Shelley and Byron might then have been among the leading dramatists; they all attempted great things, but were prevented from learning stage-craft where alone it could be learned, — in the theatre itself. Byron's dramatic gift, Prof. Nicoll considers, is immeasurably underrated, because, there being no hope for him in the playhouse, he was reduced to penning dramatic poems for the reading public. The tardy change for the better waited upon the reforms of society, and was promoted by the Act for Regulating Theatres of 1843, by which the monopoly of the two patent houses was destroyed. Then a new regime of free theatres in London and the provinces prepared England for Ibsen. The evils still to be overcome are financial exploitation on the sub-sub-letting system, the formation of management-trusts, and the insufficient number of repertory theatres. I would like to add, the lack of municipal and government support: there is no "Stadt-Theater" in all London, and the dilapidated state of the "Old Vic." was remedied by private munificence.

Supplementing the *introductions* to periods, Prof. Nicoll gives us *backward glances* at the end of each section, statements of the tendencies developed in the fifty years or so under review. These prefaces and retrospects can be read consecutively as a bird's eye survey of stage history and a summary of dramatic theory, to which the body of the work serves as illustrative materials. The final chapters estimate the present state of the revived British Drama, A. Pinero, Henry Jones, Wilde, Galsworthy, Granville Barker, Masefield, Miss Clemence Dane, Stanly Haughton, St. John Ervine, many Irish dramatists besides Singe, Yeats and Lady Gregory; Barrie (whose vein of whimsicality and sentiment does not invariably produce masterpieces like *Dear Brutus*); Lord Dunsany (drama of fear), Drinkwater, Lascelles Abercrombie and many more up to G. B. S. I think that most of Prof. Nicoll's judgements, favourable or otherwise, have a chance of being endorsed by posterity. Meanwhile they may be gratefully accepted as the best guidance possible to those interested in the modern British drama, which in its present astounding range from trash to masterpieces of the most varied natures, is going through a flowering season such as it has not seen since the spacious days of Elizabeth. The book closes with a discussion of the new influences from abroad, from the symbolism of Maeterlinck, down to the extraordinary technique of Evreinov, the scrappy style introduced by Marinetti and the Grand Guignol. There might have been room for a note on the vogue of recent English drama on the Continent, when Paris, Berlin and Vienna cannot live without their weekly Shaw. In noticing the impressionist and cubist developments in the craft of producing, Prof. Nicoll awakens the British public to a sense of their duty towards Mr. Gordon Craig, who has to work abroad, whilst if opportunities were given him he could establish in London a theatre that Europe and America would flock to see.

*The Fall of the Monasteries and the Social Changes in England leading up to the Great Revolution.* By S. B. LILJEGREN. 150 pp. Lund and Leipzig, 1925.

Much of this book is worthless, a good deal of it quite unreadable and, what is as serious, likely to serve no useful purpose as material for other people's labours.

So far as can be gathered from Mr. Liljegren's rather chaotic arguments, he is trying to prove Harrington's doctrine that the political balance of the state depends upon the ownership of land therein. He elaborates the view — one that is perfectly correct and perfectly well-known — that there was an immense transfer of land during the 16<sup>th</sup> century, which resulted in the creation of a new landed aristocracy drawn from the middle class, and that this transfer was due largely to the royal policy of dissolving the monasteries. But one of the many historical facts which he totally fails to realise is that this new territorial aristocracy — the Cecils, the Russells and so on — made up a considerable proportion of that very House of Lords which, he holds, was so powerless in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. So also of the real relationship of the average member of the House of Commons to his constituency in the 16<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> century he appears to have no knowledge (cf. p. 146). But to point out all his errors of historical interpretation would be to rewrite the thesis.

Over one half of his 150 pages is filled with a chronological list of grants of monastic lands: some of the entries are taken from Dugdale, most from sources that Mr. Liljegren fails to specify. The list is neither complete nor informative: no attempt whatever is made to elucidate the extremely complicated story of these land transactions; all are listed as though they were of exactly the same nature and invariably the conditioning phrases of the grants are omitted. From such a list no conclusions of value can be drawn, and Mr. Liljegren draws none. All this is the more to be regretted, as there is room for a great deal of careful research into such questions as land-jobbing, nominal value purchases and other kindred problems in connection with these monastic estates.

It is muddle-headed work of this nature, that has all the appearances of research, that is most dangerous, for it is most likely to lead the student astray.

McGill University,  
Montreal.

E. R. ADAIR.

---

*The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama.* By J. L. CARDOZO. xvi + 355 pp. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1925.

In 1290 the Jews were expelled from England, and for many years it has been assumed with perfect confidence that there were no Jews in that country until they were readmitted by Cromwell. In 1888, however, both Sir Sidney Lee and Mr. Lucien Wolf put forward the thesis based on literary and historical evidence, that it was exceedingly improbable that the Jews had failed to take advantage of the opportunities of commercial expansion which England was affording — at any rate during the 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, and that, therefore, there were undoubtedly Jews in England before the days of Cromwell.

This thesis Dr. Cardozo sets out to attack. Undoubtedly Sir Sidney ventured on a series of rather rash generalisations based upon literary evidence,

a notoriously unstable foundation; and it is unlikely that any serious historian to-day would accept his view that, as "the Jew figured in the Elizabethan playhouses at all stages of the development of the Elizabethan drama, . . . it is only possible to account for his presence there, by the assumption that he figured to a proportionate extent in Elizabethan society." With Mr. Wolf the matter is rather different: he never really contended that there were, during this period, a large number of Jews living openly in England; rather does he incline to the view that such Jews as there were in England, were there secretly, and in spite of the law. This opinion Dr. Cardozo has totally failed to disprove.

Dr. Cardozo has had to cope with arguments of two different types — the historical and the literary. To deal with the second type first: Sir Sidney Lee, as we mentioned above, contended that the prevalence of the Jew in Elizabethan drama must imply that the dramatists were able to meet him openly and unashamed in the streets of London. Dr. Cardozo examines every play of the 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries in which Jews appear, and has little difficulty in showing that their authors need never have seen a single Jew in England; indeed, if anything, these characterisations go to prove that such dramatists were usually not personally acquainted with the real nature of the Jewish people. This view he develops at some length and his examination of the genesis of the Jewish characters in Shakespeare's "Merchant of Venice" and of the view that the 'Shylock' story was taken over by Shakespeare from that play "The Jew" that Stephen Gosson mentioned in 1579, is by far the most interesting portion of his work, though even here we must protest against such things as the lengthy and arid discussion of the name 'Shylock'; it really has little to do with the subject of the thesis. The same criticism can be made of the meticulous detail in the descriptions of "The Travails of the Three English Brothers Sherley" (pp. 141-156) and of "A Christian turn'd Turk" (pp. 156-168). Except for a very casual remark by Sir Sidney Lee, nobody ever claimed that these plays showed that there were Jews in England, and they might have been disposed of in a couple of pages each; the result of this discursiveness is to make Dr. Cardozo's literary criticism seem rather lacking in coherence. As a matter of fact one cannot free oneself from the suspicion that he is flogging an exceedingly dead horse: most people who have any claim to be scholars have long realised that dramatists wrote of Jews not as they might have known them in the flesh, but as people who had traditionally become endowed in the popular mind with certain objectionable characteristics and who were to be relied on to evoke certain standard emotions — whether of laughter or of hate — in an audience's breast.

On the whole, therefore, one can agree with Dr. Cardozo that the literary evidence for the existence of Jews in England in the 16<sup>th</sup> and early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries is not strong. When, however, he comes to deal with the historical evidence the tale is different. His qualifications for the task are obviously of the slightest: he shows little appreciation of the relative value of historical authorities, and spends many pages proving things which are perfectly obvious; for example, he fills ten pages or so discussing a quotation from Stow's "Survey of London" which Sir Sidney Lee made, when a mere continuation of the quotation is amply sufficient to show that Lee had entirely misunderstood its meaning. Again Dr. Cardozo does not seem to know that Sir Edward Coke commented on the 15<sup>th</sup> century Littleton and not on the one who lived in the 17<sup>th</sup> century; as a matter of fact had he troubled to trace the quotation from Coke to its source — a trouble he

expressly states he ignored — he would have found that Mr. Wolf had been rather misled by Disraeli and that there was nothing in either Coke or Littleton to support the view that there were Jews in England either in the 15th or in the early 17th century. So also there is no 'glaring contrast' such as he suggests between the treatment of Samuel Palache in 1615 and that of the Portuguese Jews in London in 1609. Palache was a foreigner not resident in England under examination for piracy; when that charge was disproved, no further action could be taken against him. The Portuguese Jews had been secretly residing in London for years: when their religion was brought to the government's attention, they were naturally and perfectly legally expelled. There is, in fact, no doubt, as may even be seen from the quotations Dr. Cardozo gives from his opponents' works, that there were Jews in England at the end of the 16th century, possibly sometimes in considerable numbers, though they lived *sub rosa* and made, of course, no public display of their religion.

We do not desire to stress too heavily the faults in Dr. Cardozo's book, for he has achieved certain admirable results: he has definitely destroyed the illusion, if it existed, that there was any large body of Jews living openly in England during the 16th century; he has shown the futility of unsupported literary evidence when used to prove historical generalisations; he has demonstrated the dangers which await the literary critic who ventures into the field of historical research without adequate historical training; and lastly, in contrast to Mr. Landa whose book on "The Jew in Drama" appeared a few months ago, he has come to a sane conclusion on the subject of the stage Jew. Mr. Landa sees nothing but deliberate insult in the treatment of every Jew that has ever appeared in English literature; Dr. Cardozo treats the name Jew as a mere label to which dramatists attached certain traditional characteristics bearing no relation to the real contemporary Jew, and therefore devoid of serious offence. He might have gone even further and pointed out that, for all his label, Shylock at least stands out as a man of flesh and blood, a man who seizes our sympathies and compels our admiration. <sup>1)</sup>)

E. R. ADAIR.

---

*Othello in French.* By MARGARET GILMAN. Paris, Champion, 1925. viii + 198 p. Prix 15 fr.

"A handkerchief spotted with strawberries". Ils ont été six, six pauvres pseudo-classiques français, à faire de cet objet fatal quelque chose de conforme aux convenances. Et ils en ont successivement tiré „un mouchoir richement brodé" (La Place, 1745-8), „un mouchoir brodé de fleurs" (Le Tourneur, 1776-83), „un bracelet" (Douin, 1773), „un mouchoir" et quelquefois „un beau tissu, précieux et fatal" (Butini, 1785), „une écharpe" (l'auteur inconnu du ms. fr. 9263 de la Bibl. Nat., coll. Soleinne), „un bandeau" et „une lettre" (le plus célèbre et le plus abracadabrant de tous, Ducis, 1793). Et en 1882 c'est encore „un mouchoir d'une trame / Très fine

---

<sup>1)</sup> While Dr. Cardozo's English is throughout surprisingly good, we have noticed a few misprints and errors: 'derserve' (p. 100), 'strenuous' (p. 128), 'prohecies' (p. 214), 'van' instead of 'of' (p. 316). Hispaniola is identified as the 'Island of Tahiti' (p. 251), and a quite unnecessary 'h' is prefixed in brackets to the good English word 'orizons' meaning 'prayers' (p. 137).

et parsemé de fleurs rouges" (Louis de Gramont) ou „un rare et beau mouchoir brodé de fleurs" (Jean Aicard). Et les six premières traductions nous permettent de constater rapidement les limites du goût de 1750 à 1800.

J'ai choisi cet exemple parce que ce mouchoir a failli passer pour une sorte de drapeau du romantisme, en pénétrant avec Vigny (1829) à la Comédie-Française, où seul le bandeau (souvenir du „bandeau fatal" de Mithridate ou d'autres tragédies classiques) avait paru, grâce à Ducis. Le très bon travail de Mlle Gilman m'aurait aisément fourni d'autres exemples typiques de ces changements de goût, des hésitations devant un texte émaillé de crudités, de blagues et de mots, de passages obscurs dans leur trivialité. Car il faut bien faire le départ, comme l'a fait l'auteur de cette thèse, qui a été admise à la Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, entre les traductions ou adaptations faites pour la scène et celles faites pour la lecture. Mlle Gilman croit avoir remarqué, en y mettant un peu de bonne volonté, deux cycles d'*Othello* en prose, ensuite en vers, pour la lecture, suivis de travaux, prose et vers, pour la scène; deux cycles séparés par une période de repos, où les tentatives d'une meilleure traduction reprennent. Elle a relevé trente-neuf pièces, dont treize ont paru à part, ainsi réparties: 24 véritables adaptations ou traductions, une pantomime (!), trois opéras, deux livrets pour les "performances" des troupes anglaises, cinq révisions (spécialement de *Le Tourneur*, dont une publiée pour *le Bon Marché*), trois éditions de vulgarisation et une édition en italien (1857), pour une troupe de passage.

Nombre respectable d'où il ne faut pas conclure qu'*Othello* ait eu un grand succès sur la scène française: il ne correspond pas „au tempérament dramatique du Français qui veut la variété, le mouvement, la gradation", comme l'a constaté Mounet-Sully (p. 174). Reste donc un succès de lecture que les traductions de François-Victor Hugo (1859-60), Emile Montégut (1866-69) et M. A. Beljame (1902), ont connu, sans compter celles de *Le Tourneur*, refaite par Guizot, ou les adaptations poétiques de Vigny et de Jean Aicard.

Parmi ces vingt-quatre adaptations et traductions les „Belles Infidèles" sont nombreuses; Vigny, qu'on a tant loué.... sans aller y voir (cp. les témoignages, p. 97), a eu de grands mérites comme F.-V. Hugo; c'est seulement avec Montégut (un peu pédant) et avec M. Beljame qu'on a eu des traductions de premier ordre. Et pour la scène on a souvent tripotouillé la pièce, comme on le faisait d'ailleurs aussi en Angleterre (p. 74). Mlle Gilman a examiné de près la plupart de ces travaux, choisissant un excellent morceau — le discours au Sénat (i, iii, 151-193) — comme pierre de touche. Et le résultat de ses intéressantes recherches nous permet de constater que les traducteurs, devant les nombreuses difficultés du texte comme du vers blanc, ont paraphrasé, supprimé, mutilé, adouci, réduit (le X du ms. fr. 9263 fait 1500 vers de 3685 lignes de texte), ajouté des passages, avec un sang-gêne stupéfiant. *Le Tourneur* substitue l'abstrait au concret; *La Place* réduit la pièce aux deux tiers; Ducis adapte la pièce sans savoir l'anglais, Douin se sert d'une langue qui n'a aucun rapport avec celle de Shakespeare; tous coupent, déplacent; Jules Lermina (1898) fait une traduction "as poor in execution as it is absurd in theory" (p. 139); le Chevalier de Châtelain publie "the worst French translation of *Othello* ever published" (p. 143). Et il l'a publiée à Londres, le misérable!

Mutilations du texte auxquelles correspondent des déformations de la pensée de Shakespeare et de l'accent de la pièce. Douin y „philosophe" pompeusement à la façon du xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle; Ducis fait un *Othello* à deux dénou-

ments, dont l'un „heureux”, et réussit à montrer un ‘héros „sans-culotte” et „fils de la nature”, plein de délicatesse, en même temps qu'il moralise à la Marmontel; Butini sentimentalise et met le discours au Sénat dans la bouche de Desdémone. Et le “clown” disparaît ou devient un domestique; Othello n'est plus un More, mais il a „le teint cuivré”; Ducis réduit les acteurs à sept personnages; Cuvelier (1818) introduit dans la pantomime une allusion à la révolte menaçante des Grecs contre les Turcs (p. 86); bref, on en fait quelquefois un peu ce qu'on veut, même après le xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle, qui ne songeait qu'à faire une reproduction acceptable pour le public: “a dog is reduced to „le ver qui rampe”, malgré Athalie, comme le “sooty bosom” devient „un sein basané”, et la pièce une œuvre, chez Ducis, „dont la mère prescrira la lecture à sa fille”. Poor Grand Will! En 1822 les haines politiques faisaient qu'on le vitupérait comme „un lieutenant de Wellington”; s'il est de nos jours mieux connu en France, ce n'est pas grâce à *Othello*.

Il faut louer Mlle Gilman d'avoir entrepris ce travail solide, clair, bien documenté, agréablement écrit, bien divisé; elle a mené à bonne fin une enquête intéressante, un peu limitée. Il eût été facile de rechercher quelles pièces ont subi l'influence d'*Othello*, comme *Zaire* ou le *Charles vii* de Dumas père, ou de montrer comment Othello devient un type du romantique aux yeux des classiques (Cfr. E. Partridge, *The French Romantics' Knowledge of English Literature* (1820-1848). Paris, Champion, 1924, p. 73). Elle ne l'a pas entrepris, mais elle nous a permis de faire une comparaison entre la psychologie de deux peuples<sup>1)</sup>.... à laquelle je m'étais attendu dans la conclusion. Mais le travail mérite d'être signalé comme une œuvre réussie<sup>2)</sup>.

Amsterdam.

K. R. GALLAS.

*The Dawn of Juvenile Literature in England.* By Dr. G. ANDREAE. Amsterdam, 1925.

This is a disappointing little book. The writer shows only a very superficial knowledge of the subject, and the English, at times, is of a curious, exotic nature. We find such expressions as “old five years”, “not the little girl as individual, rouses the poet's interest.” In these and other constructions the writer appears to have developed potentialities in our language hitherto unobserved by Englishmen. We fear however that they will not commend themselves to the majority of readers.

There are also curious omissions which in any work pretending to be a serious contribution to knowledge, would be unpardonable. For example, the attacks made upon Ambrose Philips in the Eighteenth Century because of his child verses, are one of the most significant events in the history of the literature of childhood; yet the disparaging remarks made about him by Swift and Pope in their letters, and Henry Carey's delightful burlesque entitled “Namby Pamby or A Panegyric on the New Versification”, are

<sup>1)</sup> Comme on en trouve une p. e. dans C. M. Haines, *Shakespeare in France* (London, Oxford University Press, 1925, p. 163).

<sup>2)</sup> Qu'on me permette en note quelques observations vétustieuses: p. 16 et p. 108: il est injuste de compter les mots des deux langues dans le discours au Sénat, parce qu'elles sont si profondément différentes; Mlle Gilman aurait pu ajouter en note (p. 139 et 148 p.e.) d'autres exemples pour corroborer son opinion; les pages 161 ss. sont bien riches en détails sur la traduction de Jean Aicard; deux fois il y a un alexandrin faux (p. 43, l. 18 lire: encor; et p. 180, l. 17); la traduction de Bruguière de Sorsum est-elle définitivement introuvable (p. 85)?

completely ignored. How revolutionary Philips's poetry of childhood seemed to the Eighteenth Century, Carey shows in such lines as these: —

All ye poets of the age,  
All ye witlings of the stage,  
Learn your jingles to reform,  
Crop your numbers and conform.  
Let your little verses flow  
Gently, sweetly, row by row;  
Let the verse the subject fit;  
Little subject, little wit.

Now the venal poet sings  
Baby clouts and baby things;  
Baby dolls and baby houses,  
Little misses, little spouses,  
Little playthings, little toys,  
Little girls and little boys.

Despite these lines, and more, Carey's name is nowhere mentioned by Dr. Andreea, not even in the chapter entitled "The Place of Childhood in the Poetry of the first Half of the Eighteenth Century."

This example may serve as an indication of the superficial nature of her book. In the same way, the fascinating themes of Blake's and Wordsworth's attitude to childhood are dismissed after a few lines of trite and trivial comment.

The writer who publishes a work on such a subject as that chosen by Dr. Andreea, should dig much deeper than she has done, if publication is to be justified.

The bibliography is a fitting adornment to the text.

University College, London.

OSWALD DOUGHTY.

---

### Brief Mentions.

*Petit Manuel de Philologie anglaise. II. Choix de textes anglo-saxons.* By PAUL DOTTIN. Pp. 128. Paris, Didier. 1926. 12 fr.

The author, properly the editor, of this little book explains in his preface that it is intended for candidates for examinations in his own country, who find a difficulty in procuring English books. The amount of philological knowledge required from French candidates is evidently very modest, but the quality of what is here offered is good, and the outward appearance of the booklet is really inviting, which is more than can be said of many introductions to the study of Anglo-Saxon.

The book contains 78 pages of texts, mostly well-known specimens, both from the prose and from the poetry, chosen with a view to literary merit rather than linguistic importance, and a complete glossary translating the words into English. Occasionally there is a note to the texts, but no further help is offered. In the poetry the alliteration is marked, but nothing is said of the metre: this is natural, for it would have been difficult to treat the metre within the compass required. The texts are clearly and carefully reprinted, as far as I have examined them<sup>1)</sup>. The type is peculiar in that current script is used instead of the usual printed forms of the letters; it gives the book a somewhat quaint appearance. The ligature *æ* is represented by *ae*; in the Northumbrian version of Caedmon's hymn, however, there is three times *oe* instead, curiously enough in those cases only where the vowel is an alliterative one, which in Sweet's reader are printed in italics, which makes the ligatures for *ae* and *oe* indistinguishable. The Glossary is quite reliable, except for some mistakes in the marking of

1) On p. 48 *Dryden* is incorrectly spelt, but the true form occurs a few lines further down.

the historical quantities, which may indeed, be misprints. Thus *abugan* with short u, *andrācian* with long ā, *nydpearf* with short y although *niedpearf* is correct; *singal* with long i, and one or two more cases struck me on looking through the glossary. There are two entries for *ord* 'point' and 'beginning,' surely one and the same word; this is certainly the case for *gefrignan* and *gefrinan*. *aelmesriht* is rendered 'almsright'; it is true that Sweet gives the same translation, but I am afraid it is neither English nor intelligible. If *Geat* is to be translated by 'Goth,' what must be the rendering of *Gota*? In the specimen from Beowulf *Brunecg* is rendered 'brown-edged' as in Sweet; does M. Dottin reject the interpretation of Kläber in his standard edition of the poem? One more point: the editor does not help the reader to distinguish *g* according as it is an open back- or front-consonant, nor is there any special mark for the affricata; the same, of course, applies to *c*. In spite of these small blemishes the book, it is to be hoped, will further the study of earlier English in France. — E. K.

---

*Some Questions of Musical Theory.* By W. PERRETT. Impression limited to 250 copies.

Perhaps, at least in our country, not so many persons are interested in the questions mentioned in these 30 pages. The writer tells how he came to the invention, to interpolate the harmonic 7, already found by Tartini (the i of Kirnberger) in the scale of the Greeks, mentioned by Plutarch. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter he gives examples. By the side of  $\frac{7}{4} = 969$  cents,  $\frac{7}{6} = 583$  c. and  $\frac{7}{5} = 267$  c., he takes  $\frac{9}{7} = 231$  c. (Wallis) and goes on with  $\frac{10}{7} = 617$  c.,  $\frac{21}{20} = 85$  c.,  $\frac{28}{27} = 63$  c. (Emmanuel) and the Septimal comma  $\frac{64}{63} = 27$  c. Perhaps  $\frac{12}{7} = 481$  c.,  $\frac{9}{7} = 424$  c. &c. will come later. The scale of 12 is enlarged to 14 now, already tuned in forks.

It is not impossible that the time has come that, after the reinvention by Zarlino of the 5, the 7 indeed occupied a place in the Olympic tablature, not only for the seventh, but also for the tritonic b-f: "the diabolic interval." However this may be, the humorous and correct way of writing about this question, justifies the observation: Do the English live nearer to ancient Greek civilization?

Utrecht.

W. V. D. ELST.

---

*The Year's Work in English Studies.* Vol. V. 1924. Edited for The English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. Pp. 318. Oxford University Press, 1926. 7/6 net.

This critical bibliography is probably so well-known by now as to need no recommendation. We will only repeat a remark made when reviewing a former volume, that the attention paid to Dutch work remains inadequate. It is true the latest part is an improvement, in this respect, on its predecessors. The volumes for 1920 and 1921 ignored Dutch work altogether. That for 1922 mentioned one book and one article; the next one two articles and one book. In the 1924 volume three books and four articles by Dutch writers are discussed or mentioned by title. One or two of these entries might certainly have been spared to make room for more important work that has been overlooked. In a work published by the English Association, which has all the necessary data at its disposal, this haphazard method is really inexcusable. — Z.

---

Bibliography in the next issue.

# How It Strikes a Contemporary.

New Series. <sup>1)</sup>

## I

### American Poetry.

Pedagogues in Holland are familiar with the story of the schoolboy who, after writing an 'interesting' bird's eye view of Dutch history, stopped after a graphic description of the battle of Waterloo, observing that 'here History ceased'. Many so called manuals of English literature — and not only the poor excuses for manuals, timid, echolalious affairs published on the Continent — leave us with a similar impression. To confine ourselves to verse, — does Tennyson still loom so large as some 'guides' would have us believe? Is Browning still thought so very obscure? Is Swinburne's music still considered to be altogether unsurpassable and are his lilies and languors and raptures and roses still the last word in English poetry? Or should — ultimate resort! — the palm be awarded to Oscar Wilde? Surely with him English poetry died its very last and most lamentable death!

Nature takes no leaps, but text-books on literature do, very visibly so, reminding one of the hands of railway-station clocks, — and the leaps they take often cover lengths of thirty years and upwards. This is a deplorable state of affairs. I had occasion lately to talk a considerable amount of shop with some young colleagues, newly graduated, who had just entered the profession. Now as such people may at any time be called upon to help equip the minds of our coming intelligentsia, they should certainly be in touch with contemporary thought, feeling, ideals, art. If they are not they will be disabled from getting a proper grip of their disciples' minds (a different thing from establishing one's mental superiority over them), and their efforts to get some grip will only make these disciples restive. Such youngsters, whether assisted or not by more or less enlightened home influences, are quick to get a master's gauge. They simply *sense* his dependence upon borrowed opinions. They try to trip him up. 'Please, sir,' one of the bolder spirits will say, 'I can't appreciate the poem we have just read. Do you like it yourself? Then why is it considered beautiful?' The lad (or lass) is persuaded that the teacher of literature ought to be 'in the know', ought to have opinions of his own, ought to be able to state his personal views and give an account of his aesthetic responses to a work of art. And it will not do for the teacher to fob him off with mere repetitions of what Professor A or Critic B has said. But as I was applying my test to the newly graduated I have referred to I found them sadly wanting, and memories of similar cases, of older colleagues, who never advanced beyond this same unsatisfactory stage, filled me with misgivings. For these are the persons who complain of their pupils' obtuseness and dullness of soul, and who inveigh against the thankless task of getting their cynical and materialistic crowds of Young Hopefuls interested in literature.

<sup>1)</sup> Compare pp. 155-173 and 193-207 of the issues for 1923 of this periodical.

In our schoolbooks a generous, probably a too generous, amount of space has always been accorded to Longfellow. Now this American singer, who has his undeniable merits, is an author whom it is difficult, nay impossible, for a candidate to study critically. In the course of his studies he never hears about him. At his examinations he is never asked about him. But after the successful candidate has obtained his first appointment as a full-fledged teacher, he will suddenly realize that, with the help of some obsolete anthology bequeathed to him by a superannuated predecessor, he is expected to teach English literature. And that the chief (though unconsulted) contributor to the anthology left on his hands is Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. And that the poems representing him — *A Psalm of Life*, *The Village Blacksmith* etc. — have obviously been chosen for the ethics they preach rather than for any artistic value they may possess.<sup>1)</sup>

I am not of those who think virtue and poetry mutually exclusive — in fact, many of the finest lyrics in the world are sermons, — but it is a disturbing thing to see Virtue's bright flag put to the unworthy use of covering aesthetically worthless cargoes. And yet Longfellow is in his own way, and when the moralizing fit is not upon him, a by no means inconsiderable artist. Even among the sonorous platitudes of 'A Psalm of Life' we meet with a few poetical flashes which Baudelaire did not disdain to borrow (without improving upon them):

Pour soulever un poids si lourd,  
Sisyphe, il faudrait ton courage!  
Bien qu'on ait du cœur à l'ouvrage,  
*L'Art est long et le Temps est court.*

Loin des sépultures célèbres,  
Vers un cimetière isolé,  
*Mon cœur, comme un tambour voilé,*  
*Va battant des marches funèbres.*

('Le Guignon'; my italics).

The pity only is that such of Longfellow's failures as commended themselves to the Philistine taste of half a century ago, should be perpetuated *ad nauseam*, because the unwary tyro, who has never learned how to acquire any taste of his own, and who dare not rely on what little critical insight he may possess, takes anthologies on trust and never finds the necessary courage to withdraw his allegiance. Yet such courage will ultimately be his, if he closes his manuals, resorts to a few purveyors of general ideas, and starts thinking for himself, undeterred either by the great gestures and imposing airs of the would-be initiated or by a sense of his own littleness. However small the intellectual capital with which we start the thinking business, there is such a thing as judicious management.

<sup>1)</sup> The two poems mentioned are failures. Does anyone really understand the third and fourth lines of the 'Psalm' and their bearing upon the preceding two? Can anyone visualize the forlorn and shipwrecked brother, who, armed presumably with Mr. William Bones's spyglass, and although shipwrecked, still sailing the main, contrives to discover footprints in the sands of some reef-defended shore? As for the 'Blacksmith', he is no doubt a worthy man, — but what's the good of that flamboyantly Philistine final stanza, which is out of tune with all that precedes? I have seen it referred to — in a Dutch schoolbook — as a splendid peroration... Poor pupils!

## II

Nineteenth Century America may be proud of having produced three poets whose influence was international. There was the soothing or even soporific influence called Longfellow, there were two rousing forces called Poe and Whitman. Longfellow, prettily melodious, artist in a gentlemanly way, gave the public what they wanted, liked, understood. He did not create fashions, he was content to follow. His ideas were familiar, so were his forms. He was a good imitator of Uhland and other Germans. He was Goethe and water. He would never have thought of celebrating the Red Indian in idyllic verse, if he had not come across a German translation of Lönnrot's *Kalevala*. And the negroes of his anti-slavery poems were black, of course, but, oh, their hearts were white.

Being nothing if not derivative, an epigone if ever there was one, Longfellow could never become the starting-point for a literary movement. On the other hand, a bold innovator and uncompromising artist like Edgar Poe could only mean something to literatures with a past, literatures that had already exhausted a host of possibilities, literatures of societies that were not only refined but sophisticated. Hence the eager welcome his poems received in France, the France of Baudelaire, Mallarmé and Villiers de l'Isle Adam. Hence the endless endeavours of German poets, breaking their hearts as they strove to translate, in the metre and with the effects of the original poems, his untranslatable verse. He praised Tennyson, hailing him as one of the noblest poets that ever lived, and by way of returning the compliment the English bard studied the American Bohemian's technique: several parts of 'Maud' are as Poeësque as can be. He inspired 'The Blessed Damozel'. Walter de la Mare's career as a poet would have been quite different if Edgar Poe had never been... But in his own country the influence of this explorer of dreamland, this celebrator of the unreal, has been negligible.

I come to Walt Whitman.

A few attempts of his at regular metre and stanzaic form have come down to us, and are enough to prove that it was beyond him to master that very difficult and most exacting craft, the craft of verse. So, feeling — 'how goes the modern jargon?' — the need of self-expression, he made a virtue of necessity, and in principle made *no-form* his form, calling his poems 'Leaves of Grass', a far less modest title than it looks at first sight. Grass as a matter of fact is one of the boldest, hardest, most tenacious plants in the world. And the symbolism goes deeper: grass makes plots, lawns, meadows, prairies by a never wearying addition of one shooting blade to another, and Whitman imitated the process in his endless catalogues. He, the liberator of poetry, who shook himself free from the shackles of rhyme and metre, he complacently repeated one and the same cheap little trick over and over. The typical career of any poet who, without being a Shakespeare or a Goethe, must be rated higher than a mere 'minor' singer, presents four stages. He begins by being an imitator. Realizing this he starts experimenting. Next he 'finds his feet', producing some masterpieces. And then, alas, he gets into a groove, repeating himself and developing mannerisms. Walt Whitman was in a groove from the first, but excellent things that he wrote in 'heaven-sent moments', veritable oases and miracles, prove that there was another side to his personality, and that by the side of Whitman who was content to follow his groove, there was another Whitman who continued to explore and experiment. For without experimentation an

artist cannot create beauty. Whitman's successes 'abundantly prove what a true poet can do working in a freedom which would once have been thought fatal. It is not fatal. But..... it is more than difficult; it is dangerous', as Whitman's latest biographer, John Bailey, observes (p. 119); and many of the good grey poet's imitators in America and England, Traubels and Carpenters and similar deer, have managed to fix this truth deeply in the minds of yawning readers.

## III

## Emily Dickinson (1830-1886).

Passing by some minor forces like Bret Harte, Lowell and Riley, who in a way were more 'American' than Whitman himself, because they used dialect in their poems, I now come to a very remarkable woman, who never courted publicity and fame in her life time, and whose poems were published four years after her death. She was a voluntary recluse, a disillusioned Puritan whose Puritanism, being bred in the bone, could not be shaken off at will, a mystic of the Emersonian type, who, had she been a real freethinker, would not have committed certain whimsical irreverences which might easily be mistaken for as many trustful familiarities, of the kind that Dutch readers come across in the works of that pious Fleming, Guido Gezelje :

Lightly stepped a yellow star  
To its lofty place,  
Loosed the Moon her silver hat  
From her lustral face.  
All of evening softly lit  
As an astral hall —  
'Father,' I observed to Heaven,  
'You are punctual.'

(*'Selected Poems'*, p. 88).

'Rimes' like *hall* and *punctual* being tolerably familiar to Continental students of 'English' poetry (i.e. of poetry in the English *now*), the little poem quoted, with its whimsical thought, gives no idea of Emily Dickinson's frequent, and often excessive, neglect of form. The verse-patterns she uses are conventional. She has not invented a single new stanza, nor has she in any way elaborated and improved upon any old one so as to make it her very own. But one would recognise her work out of a thousand, not only for its purely artistic merits, chief of which is its rigorous 'economy'; not only for its personal qualities, its whimsicality, its refreshing acidity; — but no less for its grammar, faulty as Whitman's (whom to all appearances she did not know), for its bad rimes, or excuses for rimes, and its defective assonances. Compare :

My Wheel is in the dark, —  
I cannot see a spoke,  
Yet know its dripping feet  
Go round and round.

My foot is on the tide —  
An unfrequented road,  
Yet have all roads  
A 'clearing' at the end.

Some have resigned the Loom,  
 Some in the busy tomb  
 Find quaint employ,  
 Some with new, stately feet  
 Pass royal through the gate,  
 Flinging the problem back at you and I.

Surely from this kind of verse to 'vers libre' is only a step. Here are only two regular rimes, viz. *Loom* and *tomb*, four pseudo-rimes: *employ* and *I*, *feet* and *gate*, two assonances: *spoke* and *road*, two merely consonantal 'rimes': *round* and *end*. A close scrutiny will reveal that, formally, the poem holds together thanks to the assonances of the second and sixth lines and the pseudo-rimes of the twelfth and thirteenth, the effect of the full rimes being neutralized by the disruptive effect of the word *Loom*, which, though its capital makes it loom large enough, appears to have been dragged in by the hairs. *I* in the last line is ungrammatical, and owing to an overdose of cryptic utterances the thing does not 'come off'.<sup>1)</sup> In fact, many of Emily Dickinson's things do not come off. Where spots accumulate lustre disappears, and though 'lustre' and 'poetical merit' — whatever Ruskin may have asserted — are not identical, the bare, gaunt framework of thought is not enough in itself to constitute beauty. Giving us miniatures, Emily Dickinson should have been at more pains to polish and perfect. One can hardly imagine anything uglier than

Perception of an  
 Object costs  
 Precise the Object's loss...  
 ('Perception', Sel. P. 91).

or

Though to trust us seem to us  
 More respectful — 'we are dust'.<sup>2)</sup>  
 ('Duplicity', Sel. P. 86.)

Again, examples are not unfrequent of poets writing in stanzas who, borne along by some mighty wave of emotion, use the breaking through of the stanzaic form and an 'overlapping' of their thought on to the following stanza as an effective means of expression. The ending of Matthew Arnold's 'Scholar-Gipsy' is a case in point. But the breaking through of a mould fails of its effect when this mould has not previously been used in a regular way so as to have roused and fulfilled a sufficient number of expectations. And now compare such a poem as 'Cobwebs' (Sel. Poems 166):

The spider as an artist  
 Has never been employed  
 Though his surpassing merit  
 Is freely certified

By every broom and Bridget  
 Throughout a Christian land.  
 Neglected son of genius,  
 I take thee by the hand.

<sup>1)</sup> The *Wheel* referred to is doubtless the steering wheel, so that there is perfect harmony between the two quatrains. 'To resign the Loom' may mean 'to weave our thoughts into a satisfactory texture', i.e. to frame a coherent philosophy of life. Or it might refer to our actions. But what about the quaint employ found in the busy tomb? Surely it cannot be Polonius's *supper*. I take it to mean something in the way of *Karma*, an atonement for neglect of duty or of opportunities. The privileged few have immediate access to Heaven (even while alive) but cannot tell how they come to be privileged.

<sup>2)</sup> 'us' and 'dust' serve for rimes.

The last two lines, with a New England lady, trim and prim and Puritan, taking a spider by the hand, may hugely please one reader and as hugely irritate another, and there is no more to be said. We have touched the bedrock of personality. But what aesthetic purpose is served by dishing up the poems in two inorganic quatrains? Let there be no talk of cavilling. My position, the point of view from which I write, is that of a Continental teacher of 'English' literature, whose professional duty plainly requires that he should have no axe to grind and should hold no brief for 'modern' movements just because they happen to be modern. As for cavilling, it is notorious how ready each successive generation is to cavil at the work of its immediate predecessors. There is at least as much to find fault with in Shelley as there is in Byron, but when the former 'came into his own', this could not apparently be brought about without undue disparagement of the latter. 'That good man, the clergyman' of Tennyson's *May Queen* will stick in the throats of people who are confidently asked to swallow, with one of Sacheverell Sitwell's Harlequins, 'A glass of milk as white as your hand, The foam of seas that lie on the land', (meaning cows at milking-time). After being acclaimed as the supreme woman-singer of England Elizabeth Browning has come in for more than an ordinary share of belittlement, and now Martin Armstrong, poet of some achievement and more promise, is ready to quarrel with any man who qualifies the statement that Emily Dickinson's poetry 'is the finest by a woman in the English language' with the world 'perhaps'. The statement with the qualification is Conrad Aiken's in his *Preface* to his 'Modern American Poets' (Secker) and Conrad Aiken is an American who detests vociferousness. Louis Untermeyer, in his very valuable 'Critical Anthology' called 'Modern American Poetry' (First Ed. 1919, Third Ed. 1926) expresses himself in stronger terms: 'In the greater number of [her] poems the leap of thought is so daring, the gaps so thrilling, that moments which, in a lesser spirit, would have turned to pretty or audacious conceits become startling snatches of revelation... Her gnomic imagery is tremendous in implication and the range is far greater than a first reading reveals... Her tiny quatrains are lavish with huge ideas and almost overpowering figures. She speaks of music as "the silver strife"; she sees the railway train "lap the miles and lick the valleys up"; ... she glimpses evening "the housewife in the west" sweeping the sunset "with many colored brooms"... She wrote chiefly of four things: Love, Nature, Life, Death. But what immensities were sounded within this gamut! And though these encomiums are rather of the nature of a panegyric, much in them may be conceded. When, however, he adds: 'The lapses and tyrannies become a positive charm — one even suspects they were deliberate', I must demur. To commit wilful *gaucheries* week in week out is the work of clowns, and even a beloved person's tricks of speech will weary us at last.

At half-past three, a single bird  
Unto a silent sky  
Propounded but a single term  
Of cautious melody.

At half-past four, experiment  
Had subjugated test,  
And lo! her silver principle  
Supplanted all the rest.

At half-past seven, element  
 Nor implement was seen,  
 And place was where the presence was,  
 Circumference between.

(*'Sel. P.'* p. 125).

In this excellent nature-poem Emily Dickinson has judged herself. She feels, just like Shelley, that a poet ought to be hidden in the light of his thought. But she is not hidden, and if Louis Untermeyer is right, she does not wish to be hidden, and continually draws our attention by making little uncouth noises.

#### IV

##### Edwin Arlington Robinson. (Born 1869.)

Nothing uncouth is here, no tricks of speech, nor even any tricks of punctuation. His verse has swing, strength and variety. He has some fancy, but far more imagination. Like Chaucer, he has sat at the receipt of custom (thanks to Theodore Roosevelt), and like Chaucer he has mixed with his fellowmen. Saints as well as sinners, he knows them and interprets them and presents them to our eyes with three dimensions. Like Browning, whose sub-dramatic method he sometimes makes his own, he is mostly interested in failures, both real (e.g. 'Miniver Cheevy', the little impotent aesthete and would-be superman) and apparent (e.g. 'Flammonde').

The man Flammonde, from God knows where,  
 With firm address and foreign air,  
 With news of nations in his talk  
 And something royal in his walk,  
 With glint of iron in his eyes,  
 But never doubt nor yet surprise  
 Appeared, <sup>1)</sup> and stayed, and held his head  
 As one by kings accredited.

Erect, with his alert repose  
 About him, and about his clothes,  
 He pictured all tradition hears  
 Of what we owe to fifty years.  
 His cleansing heritage of taste  
 Paraded neither want nor waste;  
 And what he needed for his fee  
 To live, he borrowed graciously.

He never told us what he was,  
 Or what mischance, or other cause,  
 Had banished him from better days  
 To play the Prince of Castaways.  
 Meanwhile he played surpassing well  
 A part, for most, unplayable;  
 In fine, one pauses, half afraid  
 To say for certain that he played.

Now this adventurer *had a way with him*, and 'was taken on by friends not easy to be won'.

<sup>1)</sup> Appeared in *Tilbury Town*, Edwin A. Robinson's *Casterbridge*.

Moreover, many a malcontent  
He soothed and found munificent;  
His courtesy beguiled and foiled  
Suspicion that his years were soiled;  
His mien distinguished any crowd,  
His credit strengthened when he bowed;  
And women, young and old, were fond  
Of looking at the man Flammonde.

He made himself useful in Tilbury, he made scandal-mongers and Pharisees ashamed of themselves, he saw to it that a lad of promise but without means could get an education, he was the accepted peace-maker and mediator:

There were two citizens who fought  
For years and years, and over nought;  
They made life awkward for their friends,  
And shortened their own dividends.  
The man Flammonde said what was wrong  
Should be made right; nor was it long  
Before they were again in line,  
And had each other in to dine.

Meanwhile the puzzling fact remained that this wonderful person, who could and did help so many people, lacked the necessary something to make his own life a success:

What small satanic sort of kink  
Was in his brain? What broken link  
Withheld him from the destinies  
That came so near to being his?

The question remains unanswered, and perhaps it is better thus, if only to make us realize our indebtedness to fellow-creatures, now living, whose good offices (if we are conscious of any) we simply take for granted. Since good art presupposes an intense preoccupation with life, it cannot have any feud with ethics, and 'pure poetry' and 'pure beauty' are chimæras of 'pure insipidity'. E. A. Robinson has nothing in common with those so-called poets who fashion

..... in a shrewd mechanic way,  
Songs without souls, that flicker for a day,  
To vanish in irrevocable night.

What does it mean, this barren age of ours?  
Here are the men, the women, and the flowers,  
The seasons, and the sunset, as before.  
What does it mean?

('Coll. Poems', 93.)

Tumultuously void of a clean scheme  
Whereon to build, whereof to formulate,  
The legion life that riots in mankind  
Goes ever plunging upward, up and down,  
Most like some crazy regiment at arms,  
Undisciplined of aught but Ignorance,  
And ever led resourcelessly along  
To brainless carnage by drunk trumpeters.

While we are drilled in error, we are lost  
Alike to truth and usefulness...

(Id. 101.)

Though the sick beast infect us, we are fraught  
Forever with indissoluble Truth...

(Id. 104.)

I have given these snatches not only because they are characteristic of Edwin A. Robinson the man, but also to satisfy those — I am not of them — who identify poetry with colourful or enamelled utterance. What Souriau ('La Beauté Rationnelle', p. 316) observes of similar tastes in painting holds good of Literature too: 'On peut dire que vraiment la couleur tient une place abusive dans nos préférences esthétiques. Nous l'aimons trop, ou plutôt, en comparaison, nous n'aimons pas assez le reste. Il nous faut un effort pour admirer à sa juste valeur la perfection de la forme, qui a pourtant une plus grande valeur... Nous prenons notre éblouissement pour de l'admiration.' It is not yet the time to write at any length about this important poet as a 'builder' or 'shaper', because such an investigation must start from the assumption that he has found readers in Europe who have made themselves sufficiently familiar with his work. I can now only point out certain things done by him that seem to me both characteristic and good. There is 'The Gift of God', that poignant rendering of the exalted vision that a fond mother has of a very, very ordinary son, in whom nobody else can see anything remarkable, whereas she will 'read his name around the earth' and see him 'faring upward through her dream',

'Half clouded with a crimson fall  
Of roses thrown on marble stairs.'

There is 'Captain Craig' on his death-bed, full of death-bed humour to the last, requesting that Chopin's funeral march be not played at his burial. There is 'Ben Jonson Entertains a Man from Stratford' with a full-sized portrait of Shakespeare as seen through the keen but sympathetic eyes of masterful Ben. In this as in 'Rembrandt to Rembrandt' he uses Browning's subdramatic methods, thereby (inevitably) challenging comparison with his master. He has not imitated any of Browning's more questionable peculiarities as regards diction. His blank verse is more regular, oftener 'endstopped'. It seems difficult to say more. Yet a palpable difference is there. I do not think the following lines, used by Robinson's Ben Jonson of the man Shakespeare, could be mistaken for Browning's:

'The sessions<sup>1)</sup> that are now too much his own,  
The rolling inward of a stilled outside,  
The churning out of all those blood-fed lines,  
The nights of many schemes and little sleep,  
The full brain hammered hot with too much thinking,  
The vexed heart over-worn with too much aching,

Is not what makes a man to live forever.'

(Coll. P. 30, 31.)

The explanation is perhaps that Browning is more scientifically inquisitive than Robinson, and that the latter's sympathies are larger and deeper. It is this, too, which makes him come out victorious in a contest with another Victorian worthy, the Tennyson of 'The Idylls of the King'. It has been said that Tennyson moralized the Arthurian legend to death, but that this is the fault of Tennyson's narrowness of heart and not the fault of ethics is clearly demonstrated by the *Merlin* and the *Lancelot* of Robinson, who, like

<sup>1)</sup> Compare Shakespeare's thirtieth Sonnet.

Tennyson, has gone for inspiration to old Malory, and, like Tennyson, has depicted an old order breaking up, and, again, has done this in blank verse. His *endings* are remarkable, being impressive but played 'on muted strings' so to say. This is the way *Lancelot* ends, after the hero is 'willed away from Almesbury by a word stronger than his':

. . . he rode on, under the stars,  
Out of the world, into he knew not what,  
Until a vision chilled him and he saw,  
Now as in Camelot, long ago in the garden,  
The face of Galahad who had seen and died,  
And was alive, now in a mist of gold.  
He rode on into the dark, under the stars,  
And there were no more faces. There was nothing.  
But always in the darkness he rode on,  
Alone; and in the darkness came the light.

('Coll. P.' 449.)

I have not read Robinson's latest works, published since 1921. Yet I think I can safely label the poet as the exponent of an ethical principle which, though it looks negative, is positive in its effects: 'Thou shalt not hurt, either by deeds, by words, or by glances.'

'Who of us, being what he is,  
May scoff at others' ecstasies ?'

('Coll. P.' 354)

## V

### T. S. Eliot (Born 1888).

The anonymous writer of the famous tract called *περὶ ὕψους*, 'On the Sublime', whom for convenience' sake we may go on calling Longinus, has left us a passage worth pondering about the value of examples. The drift of his argument is that when we are elaborating any literary work, we should form some idea in our minds of the way Homer would have done it, or Plato, or some other acknowledged master. Then the spirits of these men will inflame our ardour, illumine our path, and mysteriously carry our minds to the heights of inspiration. We can also, says Longinus (and this notion of his is entirely contrary to certain pet prejudices of our own time) imagine the effect our words would have upon an ideal audience of Homers and Platos, acting as judges and witnesses. But we can find an even greater incentive in thinking of the effect our words will have in succeeding ages. If, on the other hand, a writer is reluctant to perfect his utterance, he proves to be conscious of the imperfection of his thought. Thomas Stearns Eliot, a clever man and a wanderer, who not only has seen the cities of many men and played various parts in the same<sup>1</sup>), but has also taken the

<sup>1</sup>)

En Amérique, professeur;  
En Angleterre, journaliste;  
C'est à grands pas et en sueur  
Que vous suivrez à peine ma piste.  
En Yorkshire, conférencier;  
C'est à Paris que je me coiffe  
Casque noir de jemenfoutiste...

('Poems', 51.)

trouble to learn the languages spoken there; T. S. Eliot, not only a poet who has made his mark with certain memorable things, but also a subtle and keen-eyed critic with a trenchant way of stating his views; T. S. Eliot is, of course, familiar with this point of view. Nay more, in his well-known volume of Essays called *The Sacred Wood* he develops views akin to Longinus's. For instance on page 44, in a paper on 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', we find: 'No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation (this internal rime is ugly, W. v. D.) to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism. The necessity that he shall conform, that he shall cohere, is not one-sided; what happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them... And so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted... the past [is] altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past. And the poet who is aware of this will be aware of great difficulties and responsibilities. In a peculiar sense he will be aware also that he must inevitably be judged by the standards of the past.'

I might quote more from T. S. Eliot, the critic, but, being anxious to come to the point, I prefer quoting from T. S. Eliot, the poet.<sup>1)</sup>

Let us go then, you and I,  
When *the evening is spread out against the sky*  
*Like a patient etherised upon a table;*  
Let us go, through certain half-deserted streets,  
The muttering retreats  
Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels  
And sawdust restaurants with oyster-shells:  
*Streets that follow like a tedious argument*  
*Of insidious intent*  
*To lead you to an overwhelming question . . .*

('Prufrock', 'Poems', p. 9)

Who is supposed to be speaking (or 'singing') in 'The Lovesong of J. Alfred Prufrock'? The writer obviously wants to give the effect of speech, so Prufrock is one of his *rôles*, and the question is whether he keeps consistently within it. A figure like that of the patient etherised upon a table is not one that might spontaneously occur to any participant in our modern culture, and being used, awaken pleased recognition in the mind of the average hearer. If we turn to Shakespeare, who very often cultivated 'wit', i.e. the romanticism of intellect, for its own sake, we shall find that the bulk of his imagery is made up of what would meet with instantaneous response in the mind of an Elizabethan, e.g. the exclamation of Macbeth at bay:

They have tied me to a stake; I cannot fly,  
But, bear-like, I must fight the course.

Everybody used to be familiar with bear-baiting, — only medical men and nurses are familiar with the operating-table. Are we then to suppose that Prufrock is a medical man, or at least, has dabbled a little in the

<sup>1)</sup> The italics are mine throughout.

science of medicine? But a man of Prufrock's diffident character ('do I dare', — 'how should I presume?') would hardly have chosen to follow the career of a doctor, *and a dabbler in medicine would have used more expressions smelling of the dissecting-room and the hospital.* So the comparison is something extraneous; the author put it in only as a proof of his own originality and cleverness. It was too good to lose, it would give the gentle reader a much needed shake-up. And so it went into the brew. T. S. Eliot the poet suffers from sophistication.<sup>1)</sup>

But he can be a good impressionist:

The winter evening settles down  
With smell of steaks in passageways.  
Six o'clock.  
The burnt-out ends of smoky days.  
And now a gusty shower wraps  
The grimy scraps  
Of withered leaves about your feet  
And newspapers from vacant lots;  
The showers beat  
On broken blinds and chimney-pots,  
And at the corner of the street  
A lonely cab-horse steams and stamps.  
And then the lighting of the lamps.

(*Preludes' I, Poems, 21*)

Impressionism, however, is no new departure. Neither is, for a satirist like T. S. Eliot, the creation of a few *Prügeljungen*, chief of whom is 'Apeneck Sweeney', who represents all that is lowdown and bestial in modern humanity, and all that is most likely to offend a fastidious man. Neither is a hatred of The Church, than which T. S. Eliot holds one of creation's natural monsters dearer:

The hippopotamus's day  
Is passed in sleep; at night he hunts;  
God works in a mysterious way —  
The Church can sleep and feed at once.

I saw the 'potamus take wing  
Ascending from the damp savannas,  
And quiring angels round him sing  
The praise of God, in loud hosannas.

(*Poems', 54*)

Apart from T. S. Eliot's impressionism and idiosyncrasies, his artistic methods (or formulas) are two in number. They are: the seemingly inconsequential *reverie*, and: the juxtaposition of two conflicting elements or circumstances. Again, they are neither of them exactly new. I might mention Wilfrid Gibson's poetic reveries in 'Livelihood', *The Drove-Road* for instance; but as Gibson's characters belong to the lower orders, who being monoglot and illiterate do not suffer from English, French, Latin, Italian, Greek, German or Sanskrit tags emerging from their subconscious depths, his work is always of a piece and its artistic effect is, to an ordinary person, more satisfactory. Better analogies to T. S. Eliot's work are to be found in Dorothy

<sup>1)</sup> Compare also 'Mr. Apollinax' (p. 31)

In the palace of Mrs. Phlaccus, at Professor Channing-Cheetah's  
He laughed like an irresponsible fœtus.  
His laughter was submarine and profound  
Like the old man of the sea's . . .

Richardson's novels, 'Pointed Roofs', 'Honeycomb', etc., which are completely filled with the successive impressions and mental responses of one person, Miriam Henderson... "Mrs. Kronen was back on her settee sitting upright in her mauve gown, all strong soft curves. 'That play of Wilde's...' she said. Miriam shook at the name. 'You ought not to miss it. He — has — such — *genius*.' Wilde... Wilde... a play in the spring — some one named Wilde. Wild spring. That was *genius*. There was something in the name... 'Never go to the theatre; never, never, never,' Mrs. Corrie was saying, 'too much of a bore.' *Genius*... *genius* is an infinite capacity for taking pains. A silly definition; like a proverb — made up by somebody who wanted to explain... Wylde, Wilde... Spring... *Genius*." ('Honeycomb', 121). The following quotation is from T. S. Eliot's much-discussed poem 'The Waste Land', to which he has gravely appended a number of 'notes', showing his 'indebtedness' to a most heterogeneous collection of 'sources', but which does not give a translation of his Sanskrit. (I have known pedagogues who likewise made it an invariable rule always to keep something up their sleeves.) Observe, again, the fine impressionism of the opening lines:

The river's tent is broken: the last fingers of leaf  
 Clutch and sink into the wet bank. The wind  
 Crosses the brown land, unheard. The nymphs are departed.  
*Sweet Thames, run softly, till I end my song.*  
 The river bears no empty bottles, sandwich papers,  
 Silk handkerchiefs, cardboard boxes, cigarette ends  
 Or other testimony of summer nights. The nymphs are departed.  
 And their friends, the loitering heirs of city directors,  
 Departed, have left no addresses.  
*By the waters of Leman I sat down and wept . . .*

. . . . .

*O the moon shone bright on Mrs. Porter  
 And on her daughter  
 They wash their feet in soda water*

. . . . .

At the violet hour, the evening hour that strives  
 Homeward, and *brings the sailor home from sea*,  
 The typist home at teatime, clears her breakfast, lights  
 Her stove, and lays out food in tins.

. . . . .

She turns and looks a moment in the glass,  
 Hardly aware of her departed lover;  
 Her brain allows one half formed thought to pass:  
*"Well now that's done: and I'm glad it's over."*  
*When lovely woman stoops to folly and*  
 Paces about her room again, alone,  
 She smoothes her hair with automatic hand,  
 And puts a record on the gramophone.

('Poems', 74-77)

As for the other method, here follows a famous instance of high, romantic feeling and the consciousness of sordid reality in conjunction, the four opening stanzas of 'Sweeney among the Nightingales' (p. 61):

Apeneck Sweeney spreads his knees  
 Letting his arms hang down to laugh,  
 The zebra stripes along his jaw  
 Swelling to maculate giraffe.

*The circles of the stormy moon  
Slide westward toward the River Plate,  
Death and the Raven drift above  
And Sweeney guards the horned gate.<sup>1)</sup>*

*Gloomy Orion and the Dog  
Are veiled; and hushed the shrunken seas;  
The person in the Spanish cape  
Tries to sit on Sweeney's knees,*

Slips and pulls the table cloth  
Overturns a coffee-cup,  
Reorganised upon the floor  
She yawns and draws a stocking up . . .

Now this sort of thing is not unfrequent in a certain Heinrich Heine, from whom T. S. Eliot has also taken over a prosodical trick:

Princess Volupine extends  
A meagre, blue-nailed, phthisic hand  
To climb the waterstair. Lights, lights.  
She entertains Sir Ferdinand

Klein. Who chipped the lion's wings  
And flea'd his rump . . .? (44)

With which compare:

Zu Aachen im alten Dome liegt  
Karolus Magnus begraben.  
(Man muss ihn nicht verwechseln mit Karl  
Mayer, der lebt in Schwaben.)  
(Deutschland, Ein Wintermärchen' III)

Seldom has a man with so small a literary output created not only stir but a school. The Sitwells derive largely from him, having created their own *Prügeljungen* (*und Prügelmädchen*), appropriated the 'Sweeney' quatrain, etc. Yet I cannot help thinking of him as of a fine fellow wasted. He ought to have been born in another time and to have imbued enthusiasm as he has now imbued pessimism and boredom, which really spoil the great artist in him. Of *The Waste Land* Louis Untermeyer observes ('Mod. Am. Poetry' 459): 'If its pages are splintered with broken phrases and distorted pictures, one must remember that Eliot is attempting to portray disintegration itself.' He does not convince me. A work of art makes its impression as such by being a whole, it is either an organic unit or nothing. A poem cannot paint disintegration by being itself disintegrated any more than an author can successfully describe boredom simply by being himself a bore.<sup>2)</sup> I have read somewhere that T. S. Eliot 'has delighted the world with *Prufrock*'. Surely this *world* (to which, in my moments of sophistication, I belong myself) is a very small one. Is not the happiness of the greatest possible number (if that number can include the spirits that are most akin to ourselves) an ideal devoutly to be striven for?

(To be continued)

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

<sup>1)</sup> An allusion to Vergil (*Æneidos Lib. VI* 893-896). Sweeney being suspicious of the female company he keeps does not want to fall asleep.

<sup>2)</sup> W. H. Hudson has given such a bore 'to the life' in a most entertaining chapter of 'The Purple Land.'

# On the Place of Prepositions.

## I

### Introductory.

1. By prepositional adjuncts we mean such adjuncts as consist of a preposition and a (pro)noun. In the following pages only those prepositional adjuncts will be discussed that modify the predicate.

2. These adjuncts may be divided into three groups. In the first place there may be a close connection between the preposition and the predicate; in the second place the connection between these two elements of the sentence may be indifferent, and in the third place it may be loose.

3. When there is close connection, the predicate and the preposition have the value of a sense-unit, and there is no break before the preposition, unless there is a special reason for it. The (pro)noun after the preposition has the function of an object, and as a rule it is not preceded by a break either, no more than *the man* in *I see the man*. This object-equivalent being a part of the predicate rather than a modifying adjunct to it, may be considered as the headword with regard to the rest of the predicate, in the same way as *the man* in *I see the man* is the headword with regard to *the seeing*. It may be added that the preposition, though unstressed, has a more or less adverbial character, and that the predicate with the preposition joined on to it, is a sort of semi-compound expression.

4. This close connection is found:

- a. In non-dative prepositional objects, e.g. *he is conscious of guilt*; *I spoke to him*. Mr. Blair *she hated the sight of* ('John Dene of Torento', H. Jenkins)<sup>1)</sup>; *we lost sight of the ship*.
- b. In adverb adjuncts (generally of place) with the function of non-dative prepositional objects: *They always sat upon the boy*; *our ship ran into the whaler*.
- c. In dative prepositional adjuncts with the function of non-dative prepositional objects: *He lied to me*; *she read to us*; *he nodded to me*<sup>2)</sup>; *he made love to her*.

5. When there is indifferent connection, the preposition has rather the character of a connective and is more independent. So it is natural that it may be preceded or followed by a break. It expresses the relation between the predicate and the (pro)noun by which it is followed, which two elements are co-ordinately related, so that we cannot speak of a headword. The preposition is not stressed, unless there is a special reason for it, and may either be joined on to the predicate, or to the (pro)noun with which it forms an adjunct, but in both cases the comparative independence of its meaning is felt. Thus *I mentioned the matter to him*, *he was in a pleasant mood* are meant to express *I mentioned the matter* and *he was benefited by this communication*, *he lived* and *his mood was pleasant*.

6. This indifferent connection is found:

- a. In dative prepositional adjuncts with the function of indirect objects

<sup>1)</sup> In expressions as *to hate the sight of*, *to take a fancy to*, there is felt to be a less close connection between the noun and the verb than in *to lose sight of*, *to find fault with*, the noun being clearly felt as an object. Still with regard to the following (pro)nouns the combinations have a transitive meaning.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. D. *voorliegen*, *voorlezen*, *toeknikken*.

or adverb adjuncts: he gave the book *to* his friend; he had bought a present *for* me; he communicated the news *to* his father.<sup>1)</sup>

b. In adverb adjuncts of place, purpose (result, effect, consequence), means (instrumentality), attendant circumstances, reason (ground, cause, origin), degree: He lives *at* Rotterdam, he went *to* the door; I came *for* another purpose, he did it *with* no result; I arrived *by* the Edinburgh express; he entered the room *in* a state of excitement; I did it *for* the same reason, I acted *from* other motives; the ship went *at* a quick pace.<sup>2)</sup>

7. When there is loose connection, the preposition belongs to the (pro)noun, with which it forms a sense-unit. It is unstressed, though such words as *after*, *before*, *without*, *beyond* etc. have more stress than *as*, *in*, *on* etc.<sup>3)</sup> There is of course no break after the preposition, but as a rule there is a slight pause before it. The relation between the predicate and the (pro)noun is subordinate, the predicate being the headword. The prepositional adjunct can very easily be separated from the predicate owing to this loose connection between the preposition and the predicate, and frequently has front-position: *With all my warnings* he followed his own head; *with great dignity* he rose from his chair.

8. This loose connection is found:

In adverb adjuncts of manner, condition and concession, and in adverb adjuncts of pure time; e.g. I heard him speak *in an angry tone*, the man is inclined to do it *on these terms*, I wouldn't swap parents with him *for all his high breeding* ('Our Boys', H. J. Byron), the man was praised *after his death*.

9. In spite of what precedes there is a good deal of uncertainty in the division. The speaker or the writer may connect a preposition that would seem to belong to the predicate according to the preceding statements, with the following (pro)noun, because he feels a closer connection there. On the other hand, a preposition that would seem to form a sense-unit with the (pro)noun, may be felt by the speaker or the writer to belong rather to the predicate. In contradicting a person who has said: "What a gruff fellow he is!" we might say: "Why do you think him gruff, he spoke *in a kind manner!*" In this second sentence *a kind manner* expresses the principal idea, and *in* is more closely connected with the predicate than with the noun. Hence nobody would probably think it strange if the last speaker had said: "It was a kind manner *he spoke in*."

This may account for the construction we find in the following sentence: Taking one into his hands, and stroking me gently, he delivered himself in these words, which I shall never forget, nor the manner *he spoke them in*: "My little friend Grildig, you have

<sup>1)</sup> By joining the preposition *on* to the predicate we may get constructions as *he had a friend to give books to*, *he had his father to communicate the news to*, etc. Cf.: I had no one else to give things to ('A Fair Barbarian', Mrs. F. H. Burnett).

<sup>2)</sup> In the adjuncts of place those expressing direction are of course included. It should be noted that the word *way* (= direction) is used without a preposition. This usage has evidently arisen from *go (come) thy (your) ways* — properly speaking an adverbial genitive, but afterwards looked upon as a plural (Mark, X, 52; Poutsma, I, 1, p. 204). Cf. She went out by the front-door, going *that way*, not because etc. ('The Food of the Gods', H. G. Wells). The word *direction* also occurs without a preposition: *which direction did he go?*

<sup>3)</sup> This remark also holds good when the prepositions do not express time (see Sweet II, 1909).

made a most admirable panegyric upon your country," etc. ('Gulliver's Travels', Dean Swift).<sup>1)</sup>

10. It should further be observed that there are many prepositions that naturally belong to the (pro)noun for other reasons, so that they cannot be detached from it. The principal groups are:

- a. Such prepositions as are properly speaking participles which have the function of prepositions: the closeness of the connection is owing to the fact that there is a relation of verb and object between these words and the (pro)noun (considering, touching, failing, excepting, barring, including, regarding, respecting, etc.), or one of verb and subject (during, pending, except, notwithstanding).
- b. Prepositional phrases ending in a preposition; in this case the closeness of the connection must be explained by the fact that there is a certain relation between the headword of the phrase and the (pro)noun. Such phrases are: because of, owing to, on account of, according to, (in) spite of<sup>2)</sup>, by the side of<sup>2)</sup>, inclusive of, exclusive of, together with, with regard to, with respect to, etc.

## II

### The Tendency to connect the Preposition with the Predicate (if possible), and to give Front-position to the Psychological Subject.

11. The tendency to connect the preposition with the predicate may be observed in Dutch and in German. The first elements of compounds as *doorlezen*, *toespreken*, *aufdrängen*, *überwerfen*, etc. are adverbs now, but were originally prepositions that governed an oblique case. By connecting the preposition with the verb, the two elements form a sense-unit on which depends the (pro)noun that was first governed by the preposition.<sup>3)</sup>

12. In English this tendency is very strong. Among other cases it is found<sup>4)</sup>:

- a. In the passive voice construction, which can be used with back-position of the preposition, if there is close connection (see 4a, b, c): He had the common sense of the Englishman, who thinks that, if *he is to be listened to*, it is no use writing like Adam Smith (*Everyman*, May 2, '13). I was piloting a Spaniard (=a Spanish ship) to the Thames, when *she was run into* ('The Tragedy of Ida Noble', W. C. Russell). He had the appearance of *having been trodden on* by an enraged ichthyosaurus (London Magazine, November '13). *Is no one oppressed by tyrants or lied to by their officers?* ('The Poet's Allegory', R. Middleton). *He always wants to be read to*, a task I particularly dislike ('The Fowler', B. Harraden).

**Observation.** In adjective clauses we often find the relative pronoun and the finite verb (aux. of the passive voice) absent, so that the past participle has an attributive function: A marriage *entered into* by parties who begin by disliking each other and ultimately fall in love, seems still the safest of cards to play in this sort of entertainment (*The Illustrated London News*,

<sup>1)</sup> Evidently the word *manner* is stressed, being contrasted with *words*.

<sup>2)</sup> Despite and *besides* expressing the same idea as *in spite of* and *by the side of* cannot be detached from the (pro)noun either.

<sup>3)</sup> See Paul's *Principiën*, Cap. XVI, p. 244.

<sup>4)</sup> In all these examples we find close or indifferent connection.

May 20, '16). I am a man *more sinned against than sinning* ('King Lear', W. Shakespeare).

b. In infinitives that are adjuncts to nouns or adjectives, as in: it is a thing *to be thought about*, it is a good pen *to write with*, he is a man fit *to talk to*, the pen is too bad *to write with*<sup>1)</sup>. This construction is possible both when there is close<sup>2)</sup> and indifferent connection (see 4a, b, c; 6a, b): Give him a glass *to drink my health in* ('The Prisoner of Zenda', A. Hope). Her skin is too thick for the blood *to show through* (Punch, Febr. 22, '22). Dryden remains incomparably the best medium for those *to taste Virgil in* who have not the Latin (Everyman, April 15, 1913). He had no one else *to give things to*, and he said I should have everything I took a fancy to ('A Fair Barbarian', F. H. Burnett).<sup>3)</sup>

**Observation.** Mark the following curious sentence: "Every bit of this is yours". "*To do exactly what I like with?*" "Certainly." ('A Noble Life', Mrs. Craik). The italicized part may be completed as follows: Is it mine (= my property) *to do exactly what I like with?*" in which *what I like* is a noun-clause, so that the construction runs parallel to sentences as: Is it a good pen *to write the letter with?*

c. In gerunds after *worth* and *worthy of*, when there is close or indifferent connection: It is nothing worth *speaking of* (Onions, Adv. Engl. Syntax, 113). Was such a parliament worth *being a member of*.<sup>4)</sup> ('Heroes and Hero-Worship', Th. Carlyle). He could have found no soul in all England so worthy of *bending down before* (*ibid.*)

d. In combinations as *undreamt-of delights, uncared-for relations*<sup>5)</sup>. Such like combinations, which are found only when there is close connection, sometimes give rise to curious constructions, of which Onions gives an example: Mr. St. John . . . was a lawyer of Lincoln's Inn, known to be of parts and industry; but *untaken notice of* for practice in Westminster Hall ('History of the Rebellion', Earl Clarendon).

13. In the cases discussed in the preceding section, the preposition though detached from its (pro)noun and joined on to the predicate or verb, has not lost its character altogether. There are however constructions in which the preposition has entirely become an adverb. Of these we mention:

a. When the past participle connected with the adverb has the function of a predicative adjective: The parcel was *tied round* with tape ('Uncle Bernac', Conan Doyle). There were to be found pools of crystal water all *trodden round* with the footprints of game ('King Solomon's Mines', H. R. Haggard).<sup>6)</sup>

b. When the preposition has been put after the noun<sup>7)</sup>: She is,

<sup>1)</sup> These examples have been borrowed from Onions, An Adv. Engl. Syntax (113). Of such constructions Onions says: "This use of the infinitive can be traced back to the earliest period of English. Thus in the Old English Chronicle we have: 'Me lihtede candeles to aten bi' = people lighted candles to eat by, i.e. for eating by (them).' " [113]

<sup>2)</sup> See the first and third examples quoted from Onions.

<sup>3)</sup> For indifferent connection, see also the second and fourth examples quoted from Onions.

<sup>4)</sup> *To be a member of* having a transitive meaning, *parliament* is a prepositional object, so that there is close connection between *of* and the predicate.

<sup>5)</sup> See Onions, An Adv. Engl. Syntax, 113, 113b.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. Dutch *omwonden, omtreden*.

<sup>7)</sup> Compare Dutch *hij slenterde door de tuin* and *hij slenterde de tuin door*.

according to the bond, at the beck and call of the employer *the day through* (*Everyman*, April 25, '13). Like the fairies in *Midsummer Night's Dream* they danced *the whole house through* ('*Dodo the Second*', E. F. Benson). If they would but stand by him, he would fight *the matter through* ('*Robert Elsmere*', Mrs. H. Ward). But as he turned *the matter over* in his mind, it seemed to him that since it was directly for her good, he would now be justified in speaking ('*A Tale of a Lonely Parish*', F. Marion Crawford). And crazily and wearily I went *my work about* ('*The Last of the Flock*', W. Wordsworth).<sup>1)</sup>

c. When the preposition, owing to the absence of the noun, has been joined on to the verb, is consequently an adverb, and forms a (semi-)compound with the verb. Such constructions as *I took off my hat, I put on my gloves, he pulled me about* mean: I took my hat off my head, I put my gloves on my hands, he pulled me about the place.<sup>2)</sup> In these compounds or semi-compounds the adverbs are so strongly stressed that they are mostly preceded by unstressed objects:

Their gratification had been awakened by seeing him *wheeled in* ('*Pickwick Papers*', Ch. Dickens). "A large form?" she inquired, *casting her eyes around*<sup>3)</sup> and swinging back her hair ('*Far from the Madding Crowd*', Th. Hardy). His dog was howling, his head was aching fearfully — somebody was *pulling him about* (*Ibid.*).

d. When the preposition has become an independent adverb through the absence of the noun: She will probably work her way *through* (= through the difficulty) ('*Hilda Strafford*', B. Harraden). The works were lit *throughout* (= throughout the whole of the buildings) with the electric light ('*Mr. Meeson's Will*', R. Haggard). For days *after* (= after this moment) the great piles of blackened snow would lie on either side of the street ('*Knight Errant*', Edna Lyall).

14. From what has been discussed in the preceding sections, it will be clear that there is a strong tendency in English to detach the preposition from the (pro)noun with which it forms an adjunct to the predicate, and to connect it with the predicate, when there is a close and also when there is an indifferent connection between these two elements. This is of course especially the case when there is a particular reason for it. One of the principal reasons for this phenomenon is the fact that English speakers, and writers too, are fond of giving front-position to the psychological subject.

It should be remembered that such constructions belong to the spoken language in the first place, and writers, who are naturally more conservative, will hesitate to follow this example. Hence when we find front-position of the psychological subject combined with back-position of the preposition in the written language, it will chiefly be in colloquial style. But when this construction has once come to be used, also in the written language, it is quite natural that the grammatical subject-form should often be used too.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> In most of these examples there is felt to be rather a close connection between the adverb and the predicate.

<sup>2)</sup> It is a matter of course that a great many phrases of this kind (*to hold out, to carry on, to give back, to turn away*, etc.) cannot be explained in this way.

<sup>3)</sup> See *Neophilologus* IV, Van Dongen, p. 322. ff. Rhythm is of course an important factor, which also explains such constructions as *he pulled the man about*.

<sup>4)</sup> See Paul's *Principier*, Cap. XVI; Kruisinga, Engl. Acc. and Syntax, 1822. Compare D. *hij gelieve het te doen*; and in the language of pupils at school: *hij werd een boek afgенomen, wij werden voorgelezen*.

15. This front-position combined with back-position of the preposition we find among other cases<sup>1)</sup>:

a. With interrogative pronouns followed or not followed by a noun. Instead of *whom* we often find the subject-form *who*, and the construction is used only when there is close or indifferent connection<sup>2)</sup>: *What* on earth did you do that *for*? ('*Pickwick Papers*'), "They (the stars) sometimes seem to be like the apples on our stubbard tree. Most of them splendid and sound — a few blighted". "Which do we live *on*? A splendid one or a blighted one?" ('*Tess of the D'Urbervilles*', Th. Hardy). Holmes detached his wire. "Whom do you think that is *to*?" he asked, as we resumed our journey.<sup>3)</sup> ('*The Sign of Four*', Sir A. Conan Doyle). Who did you come here *for*? Not for me, I think (Strand Magazine, January 1916). Who did you sell the geese *to*? ('*The Adventure of the Blue Carbuncle*', Sir A. Conan Doyle).

**Observation.** Sentences as *Who(m) was the book written by?* *What did you do it for?* have led to the constructions *who(m) by?* *what for?* Cf. "I was recommended to you". "Who by?" "The Landlord of the Alpha" ('*The Adv. of the Blue Carb.*'). "I did put on my diamonds; but — I took them off again", stammered Isabel. "What on earth for?" ('*East Lynne*', Mrs. Wood).

Even adverbs may be felt as psychological subjects, e.g. *Where did he come from?* which may become: *where from?* as in: He has just arrived. *Where from?* — Cf. "Mr Desert has just started for the East: his ship sails to-morrow". "Oh!" said Michael blankly: "Where from?" ('*The White Monkey*', J. Galsworthy).

b. With prepositional objects and adverb adjuncts mentioned in 6b, in which case there is naturally close or indifferent connection: *Danger on the field* the major knew not of ('*Evan Harrington*', G. Meredith). *This amount of truth* the rumours can be reduced to (ibid.). *The world of fashion* I did not think of, till I saw you ('*Evelyn Innes*', G. Moore). *Diphtheria* I seemed to have been born with<sup>4)</sup> ('*Three Men in a Boat*', J. K. Jerome).

c. With noun-clauses, also when there is close or indifferent connection. Such noun-clauses may be introduced by independent relative pronouns strengthened or not strengthened by *ever* (I), by adverbs (II), by conjunctions (III):

I. *Whatever is meant as kindness*, I am grateful for; *whatever is meant in another way*, I am angry at ('*Tess of the D'Urbervilles*', Th. Hardy). *Whatever you may want*, send to me *for*; and when you think you can meet your parents, I will take you to them ('*Evan Harrington*', G. Meredith).

II. And then we shall know how the world wags. *How it had been wagging*, the Countess's straining eyes under closed lids were eloquent of ('*Evan Harrington*').

<sup>1)</sup> Adjective clauses introduced by relative pronouns are not included here.

<sup>2)</sup> Sentences as \**What way did you do it in?* \**What day did he come on?* etc. are not correct, I think. But *What way did you do it?* *What day did he come?* etc. are all right

<sup>3)</sup> Cf. *Who(m) do you think I spoke of*, *What do you think I wrote with*, etc.

<sup>4)</sup> I think that constructions as \**That way he did it in*, \**that day he came on*, \**my warnings he did it all for*, \**that condition he came on*, are impossible [see note<sup>2)</sup>] to 15a] But with the prepositions absent, the first two examples would be all right.

III. *That this treatment of Old Tom was sound, he presently had proof of ('Ev. Harr.').*

**Observation.** Constructions as have been discussed in this section may depend on other head-sentences: The fact remained that *whatever he touched, he prospered in ('The Mayor of Casterbridge', Th. Hardy).*

### III.

#### The Principles developed in the preceding Chapters applied to Adjective Clauses introduced by a Preposition and an Anaphoric Relative Pronoun.

16. In adjective clauses beginning with a preposition + an anaphoric rel. pron. the preposition is often detached from the rel. pron. and joined on to the predicate of the clause when there is a close or an indifferent connection between these two elements, if it is necessary to give front-position to the pronoun as the psychological subject. The relative pronoun is frequently absent in such clauses when they are restrictive: in this case the antecedent, which is then closely connected with the clause though it does not belong to it, figures as the psychological subject.

When the preposition is connected with the predicate, we shall speak of back-position, which consequently means: position at the end of the word-group with which it logically forms a sense-unit. So back-position does not always mean: position at the end of the sentence. Cf. *That's a question which I must go into at once* (Punch, November 24, 1915). There is my embroidery as well, *which I shall work at* most industriously ('Dodo the Second').

17. The sentences *the pen with which you are writing, is bad*, may consequently be read *the pen which you are writing with, is bad*. This latter construction, however, is comparatively rare, or at least confined to literary style, because restrictive clauses begin more frequently with *that* than with *which* or *who(m)*. Besides, *which* and *who(m)* belonging rather to literary language, there is something contradictory between the use of these pronouns and the back-position of the preposition, which is more usual in colloquial style. This back-position in colloquial style may be explained by the fact that the speaker obeying the impulse of the moment is more apt to give front-position to the psychological subject than the writer, who is naturally more conservative. Still front-position of *whom* and *which* in restrictive clauses combined with back-position of the preposition is found (a).

*That* at the head of restrictive clauses combined with back-position of the preposition, is very frequently found of course (b).

But the most frequent construction in restrictive clauses is: absence of the relative pronoun combined with back-position of the preposition (c). In this case the antecedent represents the psychological subject (see 16).

Even in continuative clauses, and in clauses which are neither restrictive nor continuative, but express reason (cause) or concession<sup>1</sup>), we occasionally find back-position of the preposition (d). In this case the relative pronoun is *whom* or *which* in continuative clauses, and *that, whom* or *which* in the other group, and the relative pronoun cannot be omitted.

<sup>1)</sup> See Kruisinga, Engl. Acc. and Syntax, 1929.

- a. I am convinced that in the present kind of warfare, very different from that which I was accustomed to, no officer should be without a periscope (Punch, October 20, '16). I am not going to see a woman whom I feel so tenderly for, in trouble without trying to help her. ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles').
- b. There are two things that men should never be weary of ('Kidnapped', R. L. Stevenson). He had not even succeeded in outliving his palate — the famous palate that in the fifties men swore by ('The Man of Property', J. Galsworthy).
- c. He leapt from the spell Rose had encircled him with ('Evan Harrington'). And what is the plan you came down here about? ('Dodo the Second').
- d. So eventually he made one final arrangement with himself, which he has religiously held to ever since ('Three Men in a Boat'). It (= the form) was Alec d'Urberville's, whom she had not set eyes on, since he had conducted her to the door of the gardener's cottage. ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles').

18. In the various kinds of adjective clauses that will be treated in the following sections no distinction will be made between the cases that have been mentioned in section 17 a, b, c and d, for the question that has to be investigated is merely that of the back-position of the preposition as a consequence of the fact that the relative pronoun is felt as the psychological subject. For the sake of convenience the combination Preposition + Relative pronoun will be indicated as P + R.

#### IV.

##### Close Connection.

19. Back-position of the preposition is naturally found in adjective clauses introduced by an anaphoric relative pronoun, when P + R form a non-dative prepositional object (see 4 a):

There was a little cold spot of doubt, which he resolutely turned his mental back upon (see section 20), but which he could hardly get rid of ('A Simple Beguiler', J. Oxenham). He spoke with the broad South-country tongue, which I was beginning to weary for the sound of ('Kidnapped', R. Stevenson<sup>1</sup>). I know nothing I would not help a Campbell to (ibid.). There are two things that men should never be weary of (ibid.).

20. Back-position is of course likewise possible when P + R form an adverb adjunct with the function of a non-dative prepositional object (see 4 b):

I commiserate with you on all that you have been through ('Married Life', A. Bennett). He was irritated and alarmed by the abiding sense of some surrounding danger, which stayed with him, which he fought against in vain ('Flames', R. Hichens). She dared not to tell herself that such an impulse was love for the man whose honour she had played with<sup>2</sup>) ('A Woman of Kronstadt', M. Pemberton). She could tell you... who was the real heroine of Tyne-

<sup>1</sup>) Note that the whole expression for the sound of has the value of a preposition.

<sup>2</sup>) In this sentence the psychological subject is expressed by the genitive of the rel. pron. + a noun.

mouth Eddy's fashionable novel, *that every one was holding up their hands over.*<sup>1)</sup> ('The Man of Property', J. Galsworthy).

20. Back-position is further quite common when P + R form a dative prepositional adjunct with the function of a non-dative prepositional object (see 4c):

To this Barnes and Grossby, not insensible to the merits of the recital *that they had just given ear to*, agreed ('Evan Harrington'). Will not some observant and fearless model give us a *chronique intime* of "artists *I have sat to?*" (Punch, December 7, '21). I believe he is devoted to every one *he can do any good to* ('Flames'). I have never forgotten the woman *I betrayed and broke my promise to* ('Evan Harrington').<sup>2)</sup>

## V

## Indifferent Connection.

21. In this chapter we shall discuss the cases mentioned in section 6 (a and b), except those which refer to adverb adjuncts of place and reason, because these give occasion for so many observations that they will have to be treated in separate chapters.

22. When P + R form a dative prepositional adjunct with the function of an indirect object or an adverb adjunct, we frequently find back-position (6a):

The girl *you have promised your treacherous heart to*, has won one staunch friend ('Sweet Lavender', A. Pinero). He is a man *you should be proud to give your hand to* ('Kidnapped'). The person to whom I mentioned the idea — and I am sure he was the only person *I ever did mention it to* — was a German<sup>3)</sup> (Strand Magazine, April, 1916). A time came when somebody *she had confided her history to*, told her my claim to her was a mockery ('The Mayor of Casterbridge'). You are the only man *I ever owed a penny to* ('Evan Harrington'). I had some dinner at that little Italian restaurant in Rupertstreet, *you introduced me to* ('The Picture of Dorian Gray', O. Wilde)<sup>4)</sup>.

23. In this section we shall give some quotations in which P + R form an adverb adjunct of purpose (result, effect, consequence), so that back-position of the preposition is possible (see 6b):

And what is the plan *you came down here about?* ('Dodo the Second'). All *I wanted you here for*, was to tell you what I think of you ('The Arrow of Gold', J. Conrad). I would forget the shames *that you have stained me with* ('The Merchant of Venice', W.

<sup>1)</sup> It seems to me that this clause is purely continuative, and does not belong to the third group which has been spoken of in section 16, for neither reason (cause) nor concession is expressed by it. If this is so, the use of *that* does not agree with ordinary usage.

<sup>2)</sup> Here back position is necessary, because the adj. clause is a compound clause and the preposition belongs to the second part.

<sup>3)</sup> In my opinion this sentence is instructive: in the first clause the predicate of the adjective clause is the headword, and the preposition is so closely connected with the pronoun or the antecedent, that back-position of *to* would hardly be possible (see 7); in the second clause, however, the antecedent, which is strongly stressed, is evidently the headword, so that *to* is more closely connected with the predicate.

<sup>4)</sup> I am sorry to say that I have no quotations with *for*.

Shakespeare)<sup>1)</sup>. He leapt from the spell *Rose had encircled him with* ('Evan Harrington')<sup>1)</sup>.

24. When P + R express means (instrumentality), we also often find back-position of the preposition:

A method *which I have taken more pikes and jacks with* than any other way (N. E. D., vide *Jack*, 80). The train *we had come by*, was really the Exeter Mail ('Three Men in a Boat'). The colour-sergeant pointed his well-loaded knife towards the door *I had entered by*. (Punch, Nov. 13, 1918.)

25. Here follow some quotations with back-position of the preposition in which P + R form an adverb adjunct of attendant circumstances:

A jerk in his gait earned him the name *he went by* ('Evan Harrington'). He said that you were a man *whom no chaste woman should sit in the same room with* ('The Picture of Dorian Gray'). The position *she was in*, made ordinary intercourse difficult ('Dodo the Second').<sup>2)</sup>

26. Also when P + R form an adverb adjunct of degree, back-position of the preposition frequently occurs:

The boat travelled up stream for about a mile at a pace *I have never sailed at*. ('Three Men in a Boat').

**Observation.** It should be noted that the preposition is frequently absent before such words as *rate*, *pace*, as in: *he went that rate* (Onions, An Adv. Eng. Syntax, 78). This explains the fact that it is also frequently absent before the relative pronoun, so that constructions as: *the rate that (which) he went*, was alarming, are quite common. Absence of the relative pronoun is also frequently found: *Going at the pace they do*, it is impossible for them to get out of anybody else's way ('Three Men in a Boat'). "Oh, Jerrold, look at those three lovely furrows. Look at the pace *it (the plough) goes*" ('Anne Severn and the Fieldings', May Sinclair).

(To be concluded).

R. VOLBEDA.

## Notes and News.

**English Association in Holland.** The provisional programme for the Christmas session consists of the following lectures:

Prof. Ifor Evans (literary subject): Deventer, Dordrecht, Flushing, Enschede, Nijmegen, Amersfoort; probably ± 22 October and following days.

Mr. Patrick Braybrooke (literary subject): Amersfoort and Groningen, 16 and 17 November.

Mr. Sharp (subject: Scotland): Deventer, Dordrecht, Groningen, Flushing, Amersfoort, Nijmegen, Hilversum; probably ± 13—21 December.

The General Secretary's address is Mr. C. Bakker, Heerengracht 472, Amsterdam.

---

<sup>1)</sup> In my opinion in *you have stained me with shames*, *Rose encircled him with a spell*, the adverb adjuncts express result, effect, consequence.

## Reviews.

*Place-Names and History.* By ALLEN MAWER. (Robert Spence Watson Memorial Lecture, delivered Sept. 25, 1922.) Liverpool, The University Press, L.<sup>d</sup>, London, Hodder & Stoughton, L.<sup>d</sup>, 1922. 38 pp.

*Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names*, Part I, edited by ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. 189 pp. Part II by ALLEN MAWER. 67 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1924. 21 sh.

*The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire.* By ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-Name Society, vol. II). 274 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1925. 18 sh.

1. The very attractive paper of Prof. Mawer on *Place-Names and History*, in itself an excellent introduction to the subject in general, will appeal especially to those interested in English place-name research. To the continental student nothing can convey a more favourable impression than the conditions of toponymical research in England, whose old language and early history we are enabled to know far better than those of Western Europe during the same period. In order to show how the interpretation of place-names throws light on the history of the country the writer calls our attention to the following results of the study: identification of historical places or of otherwise unknown settlements; archæological evidence confirmed or explained; improvement and greater accuracy of our lexicological knowledge; better chronology; new data concerning Anglo-Saxon law and the division of the country into districts in Old English times; rests of heathenism etc., etc. I happen to differ with the author on one special point only. He seems to admit that the Frisians actually took part in the conquest of England (p. 11). The only basis for this opinion is a passage of Procopius who numbers the Frisians among the inhabitants of Great Britain, but does not speak of conquest. The whole passage however is so full of fabulous details and extravagant fiction that the incidental mention of the Frisians hardly deserves consideration. Much more important is the place in Bede about Frisian merchants in London. — *Apropos* of the place-name Flamstead (place of refuge, ags. *fleamstede*), I think I may perhaps suggest a new attempt at an explanation of the name *Flemings*. It was originally applied to the occupants of the Flemish coast only, who, being exposed to the incursions of the sea, were frequently obliged to run away from the floods. This could have been the reason why they were called *Flemings* (cf. ags. *fliema*, fugitive). Refuge-hills (or *fleamsteds*) are still known nowadays in Zealand and are said to have been formerly used as places of refuge for people and cattle in case of inundation. If this interpretation proves correct, the name *Flanders* will have to be explained as different from *Fleming* and my former hypothesis (*Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde*, p. 85-86) would have to be revised.

2. The *Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names* is the first volume issued by the Place-Name Society. It is divided into two parts, the *Introduction* proper (Part I) and *The Chief Elements in English Place-Names* (Part II). The *Introduction* comprises the following Chapters: I. Methods of Place-Name Study, by W. J. Sedgefield; II. The Celtic Element, by E. Ekwall; III. The English Element, by F. M. Stenton; IV. The Scandinavian Element, by E. Ekwall; V. The French Element, by R. E. Zachrisson; VI. The Feudal

Element, by James Tait; VII. Place-Names and English Linguistic Studies, by H. C. Wyld, assisted by Mary S. Serjeantson; VIII. Place-Names and Archæology, by O. G. Crawford; IX. Personal Names in Place-Names, by F. M. Stenton.

Only 15 pages are devoted to Methods. It will be evident to everybody that such a short treatment is wholly inadequate to the subject. But the fault lies rather with the matter than with the author or editor. Toponymical method can only be learned by practice and is best illustrated by examples. Consequently those chapters that discuss the main elements of the study will prove at least as useful to beginners as the section on Methods proper. Most of them may be commended as models of methodical research and clear presentation. Nevertheless a little more could have been said, if it were only to warn the beginner against the manyfold perils and snares of topographical research. In that respect, the chapter on Personal Names is a most useful complement of the first chapter. No scientific study of place-names can boast of being complete without investigation of personal names. The difficulties of interpretation are of course still greater than with place-names. But the aid supplied by the former when dealing with the latter is in many cases invaluable. Prof. Stenton does not seem inclined to recognise the existence of *Lall-namen* (as they are called in German), which have their origin in the speech of children. His chief objection is that the explanation "implies the contemporaneous existence of two sharply contrasted conceptions of nomenclature" (p. 174). This is not completely true, because the two contrasted "conceptions" are not necessarily contemporaneous. The decay of the long compound names had clearly begun by the time when the first hypocoristic came into use; and the fact that many compounds are meaningless shows that the "conception" was kept in life only by tradition. On the other hand most hypocoristics must have taken their origin in the nursery: *Babba*, *Otta*, *Tata*, *Teappa*, etc., can hardly be explained otherwise and other peculiarities, as the suppression of linguals (*Offa* from *-olf-*, *Affa* from *Ælf-*), point to the same direction. As to the opposition of two systems of nomenclature, we may observe every day a similar contrast between the rigid official system of modern Europe (viz. Christian name + surname) and much more intricate and fanciful systems of nicknames and bynames used in real life.

Be that as it may, the different chapters of the *Introduction* will appeal to all interested in place-name study and not only to beginners. The store of purely historical information gained from topographical research as exposed by the various collaborators is really wonderful. And it should be borne in mind that we are only at the beginning of the enterprise and that we have a right to expect still more when the work is completed. If I were asked to select the best chapters, I should feel inclined to put in the first place Prof. J. Tait's paper on the Feudal Element and O. G. Crawford's chapter on Place-Names and Archæology. The study of the words *ceaster*, *studfold*, *tunsteall* in the latter is a masterpiece of methodical research. Among the elements of feudal origin brought into England by the Conquest it is interesting to note new place-names attesting a feeling for natural beauty. "Appreciation of wild scenery seems attested by the two *Beaudeserts*" says the writer (p. 115), whereas similar denominations are rare or absent in Saxon times. It may be observed however that *scîne* (Du. *schoon*, Germ. *schön*) and *fæger* 'fair' are represented in Part II, which contains only the Germanic elements used in English Place-names. Even if Mr. Tait's observation is not to be admitted without restriction, the fact is none the less remarkable.

Anglo-Saxon being a tolerably well known language, the gain afforded by place-names to the history of the English language is not so striking as the contributions of toponymy to historical research. There is, however, very much to learn in the chapter on Place-Names and Linguistics and still more in the second Part of the Introduction, *The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names*. It has been observed by Prof. Ekwall in a review of my *O. Gentsche Naamkunde*<sup>1)</sup> that a number of Old Dutch place-names are formed with derivative suffixes (e.g. *-unniō*, *-itja-*, *-ipja-*, *-ōþ*, etc.), whereas similar formations are comparatively seldom met with in English. It may be interesting to note a few English examples from the list of Prof. Mawer. O. E. *bærnett*, burning (suffix *-itja-*); *filipe*, *-fyrhb*, wood (suff. *-ipja-*). — The latter bears a great resemblance to O. Du. *Feret* (O. G. Naamk. 77) name of a forest; *ācen*, *\*bōcen*, *fæsten*, *mixen*, may contain the suffix *-unniō-*, which accounts for the absence of umlaut in *\*bōcen*, whereas *bēcen* has *-īna-*. As to *swin*, I have my doubts about the interpretation "pig", because of M. Du. *swin* (with short *i*), a creek, known in several places (*Het Zwin* near Knocke, Flanders; influenced by *zwijn*, pig, in *Zwijnarde*, near Ghent, by the Scheldt, formerly *Swinarde*). *Swinford* might be "passage in a creek". The O. N. *fall*, 'place where trees have been felled' tallies exactly with d'Arbois de Jubainville's rendering of O. Irish *Tamnach*, "endroit où il y a des troncs d'arbres", with which I ventured to compare *Troncinium*, *Troncheium* (O. G. Naamk. 76) from lat. *truncus*.

The "elements" investigated are not only words, but suffixes also. Thus *-ing*, *-ingahām* will be found at their alphabetical place. All students of place-names will be most thankful for the number of "elements" put at their disposal. To those not familiar with Old English the lists are invaluable, but even to an Anglo-Saxon scholar they will be mines of discoveries. Some readers will regret the absence of a list of French elements, which will not prove useless notwithstanding the thorough investigation of the French element provided by Prof. Zachrisson's interesting chapter.

3. If Buckinghamshire was selected on purpose to form the first volume of the Survey, the choice may be said to have been a happy one. The matter is not easy. We possess very few documents yielding place-names concerning the county previous to the Norman Conquest and even the section of the Domesday Book relating to it is often "demonstrably inaccurate" (Introd., p. XXI). Consequently the whole work is based on late data, but the results bear witness to what can be achieved even with inferior material when properly dealt with. Many unpublished sources have been used and the utmost care has been given to the transcription of the unrecorded names. Every reader will not fail to notice how anxious the editors have been to take into account the topographical side of the problem. A whole staff of minor collaborators assisted the editors in their task and the substantial results they offer to students may be said to be in all respects more than satisfactory. The book is not only a remarkable effort of etymological research on place-names, but really a compendium of the local history of the county.

A few remarks of incidental character will show the interest I felt in reading the work. The number of place-names derived from personal names is very large; many of them are not recorded elsewhere. Some readers will feel some reluctance to recognise a person in *Hæfer* (p. 8), whereas *Bullen* on the preceding page is explained as *bull*: why is *Haversham* not the

<sup>1)</sup> *Namn och Bygd XIII* (1925) p. 198.

"he-goat's corner"? — I cannot help thinking the mention of lat. *mariscus* misleading, for it is only the latinizing of a Teutonic word (p. 20). Interesting comparisons with Dutch names are suggested by *Emberton*, cf. *Emmeren* (Limburg, Belg.) from *Amburnia* (VIII<sup>th</sup> century), which has been explained as Celtic (O. G. Naamk. 123); *Butta* personal name, cf. \**Butsa* in *Bucingehem* (ibid. 33). The place *piodweg* (p. 81) is identical with the *Dieweg*, a street in Uccle (Brussels); *Daecchenham* (p. 83) bears a striking resemblance to *Daknam* (E. Fland., north of Ghent), a<sup>o</sup> 1156 *Dackenham*; *Liscombe* (p. 84) reminds one of *Lissewege* (near Bruges). One spelling with *sc* (*Liscovege* 1119) suggests M. Du. *liscce*, *lesch* iris-grass, but no corresponding noun being known in English it is not probable that the explanation of *Liscombe* should be sought in that direction. An interesting question is that of continental personal names in England. The writers mention (Introduction XIX) *Sandhere* and *Agilmod* (preserved in *Saunderton* and *Amersham*) as instances of un-English names found in place-names. Another is *Lutegareshale* (p. 104) containing no doubt a variant of continental *Leodegarius*, but with an amazing first element *Lute-*, found also in two similar place-names of Gloucestershire and Sussex. These and other puzzles I am not able to solve. But I may observe that in some cases the most probable explanation is the assumption of a migration of place-names, i. e. the supposition that a place is named after another place. This factor does not seem to have been considered by the editors. Students of English must also be warned against a too ready acceptance of French influence. The accent-shifting mentioned p. XXVI is found also in German in *Forelle*, *lebendig*, etc., where there is not the least probability of foreign influence.

These few remarks are not of the least moment for the value of the work, which is a brilliant opening of the Survey of English Place-Names. The careful printing and the attractive execution of all exterior details (maps included) will appeal to all educated readers as well as to specialists, whereas the latter alone will fully appreciate the learning and strict method of the authors.<sup>1)</sup>

Liège.

JOS. MANSION.

*The Merchant of Venice*. Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON. (The New Cambridge Shakespeare.) Pp. xxxii+193. Cambridge University Press, 1926. 6 s. net.

"The only text", says Mr. Dover Wilson in his chapter on 'The copy for the Merchant of Venice, 1600,' "which can command the respect of a modern editor is the Hayes Quarto of 1600." Upon this conclusion, amply warranted by the findings of Mr. A. W. Pollard, is based the text of the present edition.

Upon the nature of the copy Mr. Dover Wilson has many an interesting comment to make. His wanderings through the Salanio-Salarino-Salerio maze are well worth following. For his frequent excursions into the realm of guess-work I have less admiration. He discovers 'cuts' on the slightest imaginable grounds and then discourses on these cuts with a self-reliance as if his feet were planted on solid rock.

<sup>1)</sup> Since this review was written a new volume of the Survey has been published, dealing with Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire. I intend to discuss this in a future issue of this journal. — J. M.

After Shylock has accepted Bassanio's invitation to supper "we are led to anticipate a pretty situation in which the Jew will unwittingly confront his disguised daughter in a Christian household. Our expectations, however, come to nought in 2,6, the scene of Jessica's elopement . . ." These anticipations of a situation which would hardly have been a pretty one for anybody concerned would seem a little too subjective to build a conclusion upon them. But they, and very little else, confirm Mr. Dover Wilson in his belief 'that *The Merchant of Venice* at one time contained a supper-scene as Bassanio's house.' By the time a footnote has to be appended to the sentence in which this view is stated the belief has grown into a certainty, for in that footnote we are told that it (i. e. the supper scene) was restored in the 18th century.

The year 1594 is fixed by Mr. Dover Wilson 'beyond all cavil' as that in which the play was revised. Gratiano's reference in court to a wolf who was hanged for human slaughter was already linked up by Dr. Furness with the execution of Dr. Lopez in June of that year. The present editor improves on Furness's ingenious suggestion and detects a pun in the word 'wolf,' Lopez = Lopus = Lupus = wolf. The lines in question, says Mr. Dover Wilson, must have been added 'immediately after the execution of Lopez on June 7th, with a view to keeping up to date a play originally recast to make capital out of the public excitement at the trial.' The Elizabethan audiences must have been exceptionally smart if amidst the excitement and 'immediately' after the execution their intelligence was kept sufficiently cool not to miss this laborious pun. Such a possibility does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Dover Wilson, but he does meet another anticipated objection coming from those who would not have Shakespeare represented 'as one who deliberately set out to take advantage of, if not to gratify, the vulgar passions and prejudices of the mob.' To these — we are afraid unnecessarily thin-skinned questioners — the editor replies (i) that Shakespeare was a working dramatist, whose express intention was 'to hold as 't were, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure'; (iii) that modern Jews are by no means unanimous in interpreting the play as anti-Semitic in tendency. The first of these replies is irrelevant, and the second both irrelevant and unintelligible. But the whole argument is amazingly futile.

The Introduction is written by Prof. Quiller-Couch in his usual bright and entertaining manner, and on some points he is even more than usually dogmatic. The three plots of the play are to be found in *Il Pecorone* and no one, says Sir Arthur, "will need to seek further for the source of *The Merchant of Venice* save in excess of that pedantry which is but idleness of the mind."

I have always felt the mixture of comedy and tragedy in *The Merchant of Venice* to be somewhat disturbing and in the nature of a puzzle. But Prof. Quiller-Couch's conception of the play disturbs me considerably more than the play itself has ever done and he certainly does not solve its puzzle. Briefly, Sir Arthur's conception is this:

The Shylock-Antonio story is evident Tragedy. "The Merchant corresponds at every point to the Aristotelian demand upon a tragic hero. He is a good man who not by vice, but through some error, comes to calamity. Up to the point where Portia asks

Why doth the Jew pause?

the play moves towards Tragedy. By Portia's challenge Antonio's life is

saved; none the less the close of the Act leaves us in the surcharged atmosphere of a court of justice. The Fifth Act redeems us into a world in which good folk are happy."

This view, in which there is no room for Antonio's intolerance, narrowness, and self-confessed weakness on the one hand, nor for Shylock's occasional moral grandeur on the other, goes dead against all the natural reactions caused in the minds of the unprejudiced by numerous passages in the play as Shakespeare wrote it. I admit that it can be proved by historical research that the minds of an Elizabethan audience were not unprejudiced against the Jews. But no amount of historical research can prove that Shakespeare shared these prejudices. For his views on the race-conflict presented in *The Merchant of Venice* we have only the play to guide us. We know that Shakespeare wrote down to his audiences on more than one occasion. Perhaps it was to please them that he made distinctly unamiable persons in the play say nasty things about Shylock, and even try to make him appear ridiculous. Perhaps Shakespeare himself was not always clear in his own mind about the Jewish question. But it is not the passages in which Shylock is lowered in human estimation that contribute to the greatness of the play; it is the passages which show Shylock as a strong, dignified and almost noble figure who is dragged down from the heights upon which his creator has placed him by far less worthy figures than he, that make the strongest appeal to our imagination. It is true that Portia, one of the finest of Shakespeare's women, takes part in his dethronement, but she opposes herself only to the one really great lapse from common decency that Shylock stands guilty of. She cannot achieve this end without toppling the whole noble edifice of the man into the dust. It is to counterbalance the disturbing effect of this fall, and not merely to dispel the surcharged atmosphere of a court, that an additional act has to be written, in which everybody shall be happy. I am loth to confer on all these lucky folk the term 'good', but gladly endorse the shrewd observation made by Prof. Quiller-Couch that nobody arrives at Belmont who is not instantly and marvellously the better for it.

Prof. Quiller-Couch agrees with James Spedding that 'Shakespeare intended to make Shylock such a cruel, crafty, villainous Hebrew as would appeal to an audience of Elizabethan Christians.' In fact, so outrageous is Shylock's conduct that Shakespeare had to give him a real grievance and excuse, which is furnished by the behaviour towards him of his daughter. 'Jessica', says Sir Arthur, 'is bad and disloyal, unfilial, a thief; frivolous, greedy, without any more conscience than a cat and without even a cat's redeeming love of home.' The extravagance of this condemnation is only one of the unfortunate entanglements into which this Editor has got himself by the highly forced view which he holds of the Shylock v. Antonio conflict, and by his dangerous practice of attributing an 'intention' to Shakespeare.

Another equally unfortunate result of this initial mistake is the Editor's quarrel with Shakespeare for having surrounded Antonio with such paltry companions as Bassanio, Gratiano and the rest. To Shylock's cruelty 'an artist at the top of his art would surely have opposed mansuetude, clemency, charity, and specifically, Christian charity. Shakespeare misses more than half the point (that is to say, Prof. Quiller-Couch's point, J. K.) when he makes the intended victims, as a class and by habit, just as heartless as Shylock without any of Shylock's passionate excuse.'

Heine's view of Shylock and Antonio is dismissed by Sir Arthur as sentimental. It may be pointed out, however, that Heine's view does not

involve him in a torrent of abuse showered upon Jessica nor in the imputation of bad workmanship and characterisation to Shakespeare.

The Notes contain many a valuable find, thus adding considerably to our understanding of the play. The repeated attempts at psychological explanation of a situation or a saying are significant of the change that is coming over the study of literature.

Mr. Harold Child has contributed a chapter on the Stage History of *The Merchant of Venice*.

London.

J. KOOISTRA.

*The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library.* (Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley and others, mainly unpublished, from the collection presented to the library by Lady Shelley in 1892. Edited by B. H. HILL. M. A.). Oxford 1926.

From the collection of MSS. offered by Lady Shelley to the Bodleian Library in 1892, on condition that they should not be seen by the public till the Shelley Centenary in 1922, this little volume reprints forty-four letters, twenty-four of which have not hitherto been published. The interest of the remaining twenty lies in the correction or completion of versions that have already appeared in print.

It will be gathered from this that the present collection does not throw any new light on the personality of the poet or on the major facts of his life. For all that, the lover of Shelley will find in it many an interesting detail which does not come under the heading of biographical small talk.

Who could fail to be thrilled, distressed or amused, as the case may be, when he reads that in 1812 young Shelley informs Thomas Hookham on the subject of books to be sent him that he will not want until he writes for them 'any works except those absolutely cosmopolitan or anti-Christian'. A passage in a letter written by Harriet Shelley about a month later reveals how the young wife's sentiments accord with her husband's convictions. 'I see by the papers,' she writes to Hookham, 'that those poor men who were executed at York have left a great many children. Do you think a subscription would be attended to for their relief? If you think it would, pray put down our names...'

Of distinct literary interest is the following passage from a letter to J. H. Leigh Hunt, written in 1820: 'Bessy tells me that people reprobate the subject of my tragedy — let them abase Sophocles, Massenger, Voltaire and Alfieri in the same sentence, and I am content. I maintain that my scenes are as delicate and free from offence as theirs. Good Heavens, what would they have tragedy! But I fear no censure in comparison with your approbation — except that I wrote this thing partly to please those whom my other writings displeased, and it is provoking to have all sorts of pretences assumed against one. Have you read my Prometheus yet? But that will not sell — it is written only for the elect. I confess I am vain enough to like it.'

The publication of this correspondence will, as Mr. Hill observes in the Introduction, make a systematic and close comparison of printed version and manuscript original possible, which it is hoped will be effected before Mr. Roger Ingpen's projected new edition appears.<sup>1)</sup>

J. KOOISTRA.

<sup>1)</sup> One of three volumes of letters has already been published. See Bibliography. — Ed.

*George Meredith*, by J. B. PRIESTLEY. London, Macmillan. 1926.

*The Writings and Life of George Meredith*, by MARY STURGE GRETTON. London, Humphrey Milford. 1926.

From the uncritical enthusiasm of the "true-blue Meredith men" to the senseless crabbing of some of the earlier critics it is a far cry. Somewhere between these opposite poles a neutral zone of balanced and reasoned appreciation of the poet's work will have to be sought and, no doubt, will eventually be found. We are not sure that the true mean has yet been established either by Mrs. Gretton's "Writings and Life of George Meredith" or by Mr. Priestley's contribution to the "English Men of Letters" Series, though between them they have narrowed down the distance between the two extremes. In aim and temper the two volumes differ widely: Mrs. Gretton's is an introduction to the beauties of Meredith's verse and prose by an avowed admirer who had personal relations with the poet; Mr. Priestley's is a searching analysis that will appeal to the advanced student who is seriously busying himself with the "placing" of Meredith. To his task as a critic Mr. Priestley has brought all the ardour of his thirty odd years, great literary ability and a mind of almost over-critical acumen. It is this strongly developed critical sense that at times proves his undoing and leaves a curiously unsatisfactory side to an otherwise excellent and stimulating book. Borrowing one of Mr. Priestley's similes: his criticism is "more potent negatively than positively, is more efficacious as a rod of correction than it is as a pilgrim's staff", or dropping the metaphor, his critical sagacity is often expended upon the detection and analysis of Meredith's failings when it might have been more usefully employed in showing us the beauty of his poetry. No one will quarrel with Mr. Priestley for pointing out Meredith's shortcomings — if ever an author suffered from the faults of his virtues that author was Meredith — but as a set-off to his strictures we should have expected from him a sharper eye for his good qualities and a little more generosity in acknowledging them. Not as though he were always denouncing and passing censures. Far from it. A fine body of praise might be lifted from his paragraphs, but all too often it is given in a halting, almost grudging way as though he were, indeed, honestly trying to do his duty by his subject but writing with one eye on the editor of "English Men of Letters", whose sympathies with Meredith are too well known to stand in need of re-statement. Still, within the limits of this regrettable bias Mr. Priestley has done his work well: the writing is admirable throughout, the arrangement of the chapters is as logical as it is, strange to say, novel and each chapter is teeming with original thought and observations. To single out one of them for special mention and criticism: we found the third on Meredith's Attitude to Nature, Man and Earth very good and very instructive. Mr. Priestley has the courage of his opinions and is never at a loss for a racy idiom or a happy phrase to give point and zest to them. Respecting of persons is not even one of his minor faults and hero-worshippers must be prepared to find some of their images broken, one or two of their pet idols lying at the base of their socles. It is as refreshing to be told in plain language that Meredith was a "pure pagan" as it is to hear other literary men denied the epithet and described as "nothing but occasional blasphemers", and, in the same strain, Byron and Swinburne dismissed for "naughty little boys peeping round the church door and making faces at the parson". Incidentally, if Mr. Priestley does not disdain a lowly word of advice he will leave "black masses"

out of his calculations until he has asked a Roman Catholic friend about them. Evolution, he goes on to say, was taken by Meredith "in his stride", a phrase as aptly descriptive of the general working of the Meredithian mind as it is of the way in which he assimilated evolution. In this particular instance his 'stride' carried him even further than we are led to believe by Mr. Priestley, for not only did Meredith turn to Nature for the physical origin of Man, to him she was the source of ethical standards as well.<sup>1)</sup> The point is worth making, because evolution in its usual physical sense affords a wholly inadéquate basis for the explanation of the more important philosophical poems.

On one phase of Meredith's attitude Mr. Priestley is not convincing, and though on minor points we might agree to sink our differences we are not satisfied that he has read the main issue, the poet's vision of death, aright. It may be granted that Meredith is strangely reticent on this phase of our existence, that in his "rapture of the forward view" he fails to do any sort of justice to the individual, that he is really trying to "stifle by drowning" nature's craving for personal immortality — these and many other things may be conceded to Mr. Priestley, and no objections made; but when he goes on to cast a reflexion on the sincerity of Meredith's attitude to death and continuance after death, a demurrrer must be entered: we find no insincerity either in the Hymn to Colour, or in the Ballad of Past Meridian or in other poems and private utterances. Hence we do not feel with Mr. Priestley "that he is deliberately shutting off his imagination from the fact (death) in order to maintain a certain attitude," neither shall we be persuaded that he is "merely pretending saying 'Not at home' to inconvenient but by no means dishonourable emotions". The simile of the two coats can hardly be urged against him, though, to be sure, "regret at passing beauty and coming darkness cannot be blotted out by a reference to changing coats". The answer is that Meredith never intended it to do anything of the kind. In his own epigrammatic way he was simply giving expression to his personal views, he was not refuting or blotting out anything. To look for arguments from Meredith would be misjudging the very nature of his outlook. His philosophy was not a reasoned system; far more accurately Mr. Priestley has summed it up in the word 'attitude'; it is an attitude, which, if ever the whole truth is known, will prove to be the outcome of temperamental promptings far more than of logical reasoning. His position therefore may have been arbitrary, illogical, inconsistent, untenable — in the reviewer's opinion it was all that — it was not insincere.

There is a slight advance in the concluding paragraphs on the reservations and hedgings of the earlier parts, though unfortunately, here again the good things we are treated to are marred by certain utterances that we should have expected from a far inferior pen than Mr. Priestley's. "It goes without saying", he avers, "that his genius was not of the highest order", and points, in support of the dictum, to the "plain lack of Shakespearean broad humanity", and again to the lack of "foursquare humanity which we expect

<sup>1)</sup> Meredith's position will be found pregnantly, if not elegantly, summed up in a footnote to Huxley's Romanes Lecture in 1894: "Strictly speaking social life and the ethical process in virtue of which it advances towards perfection are part and parcel of the general process of evolution, the general process of self-assertion being from the outset checked by a rudimentary ethical process of renunciation and mutual service, which is strictly speaking part of the former, just as the governor in a steam-engine is part of the mechanism of the engine."

from supreme masters". In an earlier chapter he had given us: "Meredith was a considerable poet but not a great poet". We do not intend to follow Mr. Priestley in his classifications, but we do not think this sort of writing very helpful. Super-critics may agree among themselves what genius is or what orders of genius are, and whether questions of priority between men of genius and poets can be settled by a cursory reference to "broad humanity" or "foursquare humanity". We for our own part are satisfied to leave to posterity the decision whether Meredith — who gave us such jewels as *Outer* and *Inner*, *Change in Recurrence*, *The Lark Ascending* and many others; who is capable of such poetical effort as he puts forth in *Modern Love*, *The Day of the Daughter of Hades*, the *Nuptials of Attila*; who, when he rises to the height of his powers is master of a prose that has been equalled by no other English writer; who, on Mr. Priestley's own showing, "comes perhaps closer to nature in his appreciation of her sights and sounds, in the feeling of her moods than any other poet of our literature"; who created "the most enchanting ladies that fiction of this or any other literature can show . . ." was or was not a very great poet and a genius of a very high order.

We make these criticisms with some reluctance; Mr. Priestley's volume is far too good to be disfigured by these strange lapses into rhetorical verbiage. They detract from the value of the book and leave the reader with a sense of disappointment. We are thankful to Mr. Priestley for having thrown fresh light on Meredith's poetry and fiction and given us two hundred pages of the best writing we have read for some time; and yet, in spite of the many good things we have gleaned from his paragraphs and with all deference to his great literary ability we cannot but feel that he has written below his true form and done less than justice to his subject.

A milder atmosphere pervades the pages of Mrs. Sturge Gretton's study: "Writings and Life of George Meredith". As an essay in comparative criticism it ranks second to Mr. Priestley's volume, but aspiring Meredith readers will count the difference in rank a gain rather than a loss. As it has been said that all history must be partial or else worthless and unreadable, so it might by the same token be argued that a full and just appreciation of poetical beauty can only be reached through loving sympathy with its creator. If want of sympathy with Meredith is Mr. Priestley's disability, a generous measure of it is Mrs. Gretton's opportunity, and friends of Meredith will be grateful that she has made the most of it. If any feature of the book stands out more than another from a variety of good points it is a detailed and discriminating analysis of Meredith's individual works, which takes their contents almost for its exclusive object and is only occasionally concerned with the age in which they were written.

On this her own ground the author is safe and though allowances have to be made for individual taste we are almost invariably in agreement with her interpretations. For the first time we see full justice done to that great creation farmer Fleming, that elemental force that is as amenable to reason and as accessible to mercy as the Fates of ancient literature. With the same unerring judgment Nataly's position is assigned as the Leitmotiv of *One of Our Conquerors*, the rest of the novel, including Nesta, merely affording the setting for that consummate piece of psychologic delineation. In the discussion of *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel* we are almost grateful to be spared the ever-repeated fact that it was published simultaneously with *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Adam Bede* and *Lovel the Widower*. Instead we are

treated to a good analysis of the main characters, no less than two pages being devoted to Sir Austin, who to Mr. Priestley is no more than a "stilted sketch". Individual taste may be responsible for the verdict upon *The Tragic Comedians* as "one of his most brilliant pieces of writing", and "among the best of his novels". Here we do not see eye to eye with the author, and though it may be granted to Mr. Priestley that *The Tragic Comedians* have commonly been underestimated, not our most generous estimation can be stretched to meet the above statements. To the same cause may be attributable a certain hesitation and jejuneness in her criticism of *The Egoist*, a "mere sketch — an exercise — beside the full-blooded wealth of *Richard Feverel*." Surely it is much more than this. Beauties are of various kinds and we can no more expect "full-blooded wealth" of the Feverel kind from *The Egoist*, than we should look for the beauties of a Beethoven symphony in a picture of Ruisdael or Turner. That she is reserved on Clara Middleton — instead of raving over her as most critics do — is all to the good: that she is able to see good points even in Colonel de Craye testifies to the catholicity and discrimination of her sympathies, but these and other advantages cannot blind us to the fact that the main theme and the magisterial treatment of what Meredith regarded as the cardinal failing of man is treated in a perfunctory, almost scanty way.

The eleventh chapter on the "Poems of the Eighties" is unusually good. Her again it is in the intensive criticism of the poems, taken singly, that she excels. What can be more subtle than the way in which the significance of "Outer and Inner" is educed from the pregnancy of "ere fancy comes". A mere piece of exquisite poetry becomes under the author's skilful handling a perfect synopsis of Meredith's intimate method. We rejoiced at the quotation of

The foxgloves drop from throat to top  
A daily lesser bell,

and wondered whether the added remark had been suggested by the translation of a French critic who came sadly to grief over the two lines. To a reader whose botany does not include foxgloves the passage may well be meaningless, but to one who has seen the florescence of *digitalis purpurea* it is a jewel of neatness and compression.

Whatever Mrs. Gretton says on the poems taken individually is all very good and even to advanced Meredith readers very teaching and very informative. It is when she makes Meredith's poetry and artistry her theme that she is not so sure of her ground. Again and again we hung in suspense over statements to which we could not or only partially subscribe. "Always, when faced with a choice, he has let go the emotional unity rather than sacrifice the fidelity of his observation", is a thesis that would take a small treatise to establish or to refute, and though we are not fully convinced that Mrs. Gretton is wrong and we are right, we confess that we should back the refuting disputant. But when she proceeds to say that "it is in his power of perfectly and indissolubly wedding metre and descriptive story that George Meredith's peculiar contribution to English poetry largely consists", we entirely disagree. If it comes to Meredith's peculiar contribution to English literature he has other and weightier claims.

There is one more criticism we should like to make. Mrs. Gretton's study is presented to the public under the title "Writings and Life of George Meredith". It is only fair that the reader should know that the biographical part does not give the whole truth as regards certain unamiable

traits that we deplore in Meredith's character. The deficiency may be made up by such treatises as Mr. Priestley's, or Mr. S. M. Ellis's or even by the "Memories" of Lady Butcher, whose attempts (often unsuccessful) at whitewashing the object of her veneration undoubtedly show that Meredith's faults were more than minor failings.

The next year but one will witness the hundredth anniversary of Meredith's birthday, and very likely it will be made the occasion of a reaction to the movement against Meredith that set in seven or eight years ago. It is too early to prognosticate the intensity of the reaction; this much can be said: If ever the pendulum of literary fame swings back to Meredith it will be owing to the sympathetic appreciation of friends like Mrs. Gretton's rather than to the drastic methods of over-impartial critics like Mr. Priestley.

Nijmegen.

C. VAN SPAENDONCK.

## Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*The Riddles of Aldhelm.* Text and Verse Translation with Notes. By J. H. PITMAN, 1925. (Yale Studies in English, LXVII.) 8vo (9×5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. xviii+80. Yale University Press & Milford. Paper cover, 4s. 6d. net.

*The Book of Troilus and Criseyde.* By GEOFFREY CHAUCER. Edited from all the known manuscripts by ROBERT KILBURN ROOT. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ×6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xi+573 pp. Princeton: University Press. London: Milford, 1926. 27s. n.

*A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions* (1578). Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ ×7, xxvi+246 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 21s. n.

*Willowbie His Avisa:* or The True Picture of a Modest Maide and of a Chaste and Constant Wife. 1594. With a Critical essay by G. B. HARRISON. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ×5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 271 pp. John Lane. Bodley Head Quartos, vol. XV. 1926. 6/- net.

*The Book of Robert Southwell:* Priest, Poet, Prisoner. By CHRISTOBEL M. HOOD. 8×6, vii+157 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*Venus and Anchises* (Brittain's Ida). And Other Poems. By PHINEAS FLETCHER. Edited from a Sion College MS. for the Royal Society of Literature. By ETHEL SEATON, with a preface by F. S. BOAS. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ ×6, li+125 pp. Milford. 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

JOHN MILTON: Poems in English, with illustrations by WILLIAM BLAKE. 10×6 $\frac{1}{2}$ . *Paradise Lost*. 352 pp. *Miscellaneous Poems*: *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*. 283 pp. Nonesuch Press. 1926. 47s. 6d. n.

*Satirical Poems* published anonymously by WILLIAM MASON. With notes by HORACE WALPOLE. Now first printed from his manuscript. Edited with an exposé of the mystification, notes and index by PAGET TOYNBEE. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ ×8, 158 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 42s. n.

*Poems on Several Occasions Written in the Eighteenth Century.* Edited by KATHLEEN W. CAMPBELL, B. Litt. Pp. 212. The Percy Reprints, no. IX. Oxford, Blackwell, 1926. 6/- net. [A review will appear.]

*The Prophetic Writings of William Blake.* In two volumes, 9×6. Edited with a general index of symbols, commentary, and appendices, by D. J. STOSS, C. B. E., and J. P. R. WALLIS. Vol. I. xvi+649 pp. Vol. II., xxii+361 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 42s. n.

*The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* Newly edited by ROGER INGPEN and WALTER E. PECK. Correspondence. Volumes VIII-IX-X. Volume VIII. *Letters*, 1803 to 1812. Edited by ROGER INGPEN. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ ×6 $\frac{3}{4}$ , lxviii+339 pp. For the Julian Editions, Ernest Benn. 1926. Sets only, 63s. n.

This very handsome edition, of which Volume VIII is the first to be issued, is intended to replace the edition of Buxton Forman, published more than forty years ago, and now out of print. It is hoped to issue the remaining volumes at intervals of six weeks or two months. Volume VIII, which Mr Ingpen edits, contains 181 letters, carefully annotated, and preceded by short lives of all the correspondents. Particular attention is paid to the text, which has notoriously suffered in the past. As many as one hundred letters not previously included in collections of this kind will be published in Volumes VIII-X, some of them for the first time. The edition is limited to 495 sets for sale in Great Britain and 25 for sale in the United States. [T.]

*A Book of English Verse Satire.* Chosen and annotated by A. G. BARNES.  $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ , xx + 172 pp. Methuen. 4s. 6d. n.

*Poems in One Volume.* By J. C. SQUIRE.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xi + 244 pp. Heinemann, 1926. 8s. 6d. n.

*Going to the Stars.* By VACHEL LINDSAY.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , viii + 102 pp. Appleton, 1926. 6s. n.

SIR PHILIP SIDNEY. The Countess of Pembroke's *Arcadia*. Being the Original Version, now for the first time printed. Edited by ALBERT FEUILLERAT. Crown 8vo, viii + 404 pp. [Cambridge English Classics. The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney. Vol. IV]. Cambridge University Press, 1926. 12s. 6d. net.

*The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker.* Edited by F. P. WILSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xl + 268 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 9s. n.

*An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews.* By HENRY FIELDING. With an Introduction by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON.  $8 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , xi + 80 pp. Waltham Saint Lawrence, Berks: Golden Cockerel Press. 1926. 15s. n.

*Plan of A Novel.* According to Hints from various Quarters. By JANE AUSTEN. With opinions on "Mansfield Park" and "Emma", collected and transcribed by her, and other documents. Printed from the originals.  $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$ , 35 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 21s. n.

*Two Chapters of Persuasion.* Printed from Jane Austen's Autograph.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ , 39 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 5s. n.

*The Best Short Stories of 1925.* II, American. Selected by EDWARD J. O'BRIEN.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xvii + 449 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*Ulick and Soracha.* By GEORGE MOORE.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 286 pp. Nonesuch Press. 1926. 42s. n.

*The Connoisseur and Other Stories.* By WALTER DE LA MARE.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , 358 pp. Collins. 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Two or Three Graces, and Other Stories.* By ALDOUS HUXLEY.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 272 pp. Chatto and Windus. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Incredulity of Father Brown.* By G. K. CHESTERTON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 296 pp. Cassell. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*Far End: a novel.* By MAY SINCLAIR.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 253 pp. Hutchinson. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*The World of William Clissold: a novel at a new angle.* By H. G. WELLS. In three volumes.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I., 245 pp. E. Benn. 1926. 7s. 6d. n. [Vol. II., Oct. 1st.; Vol. III., Nov. 1st.]

*The Silver Spoon.* By JOHN GALSWORTHY.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 323 pp. Heinemann. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Casuarina Tree.* Six Stories by W. S. MAUGHAM.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , viii + 311 pp. Heinemann. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Merchant of Venice.* Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON. (The New Shakespeare.)  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , xxxii + 193 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1926. 6s. n. [See Review.]

*The Merchant of Venice.* With an Introduction and Notes by J. KOOISTRA.  $19\frac{1}{2} \times 13\frac{1}{2}$  c.M., xx + 111 pp. Utrecht, Kemink, 1926. F. 1.25.

*Plays.* (Sixth Series.) *The Forest, Old English, The Show.* By JOHN GALSWORTHY.  $7 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 105 pp. Duckworth. 7s. n.

*Robert Burns.* A Play. By JOHN DRINKWATER.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 93 pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. 3s. 6d. n.

*Wat Tyler, and other Plays.* By HALCOTT GLOVER.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 341 pp. Kegan Paul. 7s. 6d. n.

*All God's Children Got Wings. Desire under the Elms, and Welded.* By EUGENE O'NEILL.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 74 + 115 + 91 pp. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Plough and the S'ars.* A tragedy in four acts. By SPAN O'CASEY.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , viii + 137 pp. Macmillan. 5s. n.

*Juno and the Paycock. — The Shadow of a Gunman.* By SEAN O'CASEY. Macmillan. 7/6 net.

*David.* A play. By D. H. LAWRENCE. 9×6, 128 pp. Martin Secker. 15s. n.

*Escape:* An Episodic Play in a prologue and Two Parts. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. 7×5½, 100 pp. Duckworth. 1926 2s. 6d. n.

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*The Beginning of the New Testament* Translated by WILLIAM TYNDALE, 1525. Facsimile of the Unique Fragment of the uncompleted Cologne edition. With an introduction by ALFRED W. POLLARD. 9×7. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 21s. n.

*Le Mystère Shakespearien.* Par G. CONNES. 8vo. pp. 264. Boivin, 1926. 10 fr.

*Shakespeare, acteur-poète.* Par LONGWORTH-CHAMBRUN. Plon-Nourrit, 1926. 12 fr.

*Glimpses of Ben Jonson's London.* By N. ZWAGER. 24×16 c.M. Pp. xxii+215. Amsterdam, Swets & Zeitlinger, 1926. [A review will appear.]  
Diss. Amsterdam.

*Fielding the Novelist.* A Study in Historical Criticism. By F. T. BLANCHARD. 9½×6½, xiv+655 pp. Yale University Press & Milford. 1926. 30s. n. [A review will appear].

*Goldsmith's Animated Nature.* A Study of Goldsmith. By J. H. PITMAN. 1924. (Yale Studies in English, lxvi) 8vo (9×5¾), pp. 160, with 12 illustrations. Yale University Press. Milford. Paper cover, 9s. net.

Primarily a study of Goldsmith, in which Animated Nature is merely a tool. A newly discovered portrait of Goldsmith is reproduced.

*The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith.* By KATHARINE C. BALDERSTON. 7½×5½, 61 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1926. 3s. 6d. n.

*Letters of Horace Walpole.* Selected by DOROTHY M. STUART. With introduction, notes and exercises. Pp. 236. 1926. Harrap, 2/6 net.

*The Critical Opinions of Samuel Johnson.* Arranged and compiled with an Introduction by JOSEPH EPES BROWN. A compilation and interpretation of Dr. Johnson's Principles of Criticism (Part One), and his Opinions of Authors and Works (Part Two) 9×6, lxxvi+551 pp. Princeton: University Press. London: Milford. 1926. 31s. 6d. n.

The opinions are divided into two sections, the first setting forth Johnson's general critical principles; the second recording his *dicta* regarding particular authors and works. The aim has been to preserve as much as possible by actual quotation, not merely the kernel of thought, but the Johnsonian vigour of expression.

*Mrs. Radcliffe — Her Relation towards Romanticism.* By A. A. S. WIETEN. 24×16 c.M. Pp. 146. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1926.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*German Influence in the English Romantic Period,* 1788-1818, with special reference to Scott, Coleridge, Shelley, and Byron. By F. W. STOKOE. 9×6, xi+202 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1926. 12s. 6d. n.

*The Political Ideas of the English Romantics.* By CRANE BRINTON. 9×6, 242 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1926. 15s. n.

*Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* By HUGH L'ANSON FAUSSET. 8½×6, 350 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1926. 12s. 6d. n.

*A Wiltshire Parson and his Friends.* The correspondence of WILLIAM LISLE BOWLES. Together with four hitherto unidentified Reviews by COLERIDGE. Edited by GARLAND GREEVER. 9×6, xv.+207 pp. Constable, 1926. 10s. 6d. net.

*Ruskin (and others) on Byron.* By R. W. CHAMBERS. English Association. Pamphlet No. 62. 8vo (9¾×6), pp. 28. Milford, 1925. Paper cover, 2s. 6d. net.

*Keats.* By H. W. GARROD. 8×5½, 157 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 5s. n.

*The Mind of John Keats.* By CLARENCE DEWITT THORPE. 9½×6½, ix+209 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

*Sheridan to Robertson.* A Study of the Nineteenth Century London Stage. By ERNEST BRADLEE WATSON. 9×6, xix+485 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford, 1926. 25s. n.

*Benjamin Disraeli: The Romance of a Great Career, 1804-1881.* By the Right Hon. SIR EDWARD CLARKE. 9×6, ix+308 pp. Murray. 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Robert Stephen Hawker: A Study of his Thought and Poetry.* By MARGARET F. BURROWS.  $9 \times 6$ , xi + 191 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1926. 8s. 6d. n.

*The Dramas of Alfred Lord Tennyson.* By C. G. H. JAPIKSE.  $21 \times 16$  c.M. Pp. 167. Macmillan, 1926.

Diss Amsterdam

*Charles Dickens, Shorthand Writer: The Prentice Days of a Master Craftsman.* By WILLIAM J. CARLTON.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 149 pp. Cecil Palmer. 1926. 5s. n.

*Edgar Allan Poe: A Study in Genius.* By JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ , x + 244 pp. Knopf. 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Herman Melville.* By JOHN FREEMAN.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , x + 200 pp. Macmillan. 1926. 5s. n. [A review will appear.]

*Walt Whitman.* By JOHN BAILEY. Pp. 220. Macmillan, 1926. 5/- net. [A review will appear.]

*George Meredith.* By J. B. PRIESTLEY.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , vii + 204 pp. Macmillan, 1926. 5s. n. [See Review.]

*The Writings and Life of George Meredith: A Centenary Study.* By MARY STURGE GRETTON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , vi + 250 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1926. 5s. n. [See Review.]

*William Morris.* By HOLBROOK JACKSON.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$ , 160 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1926. 5s. n.

*The Life of Francis Thompson.* By EVERARD MEYNELL.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , vii + 280 pp. Burns, Oates. 1926. 6s. n.

First published in 1918.

*The Romantic '90's.* By RICHARD LE GALLIENNE.  $9 \times 6$ , 201 pp. Putnams. 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Joseph Conrad in the Congo.* By G. JEAN-AUBRY.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 75 pp. Bookman's Journal. 1926. Limited Edition. 25s. n.

*Joseph Conrad as I Knew Him.* By JESSIE CONRAD.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 3\frac{1}{4}$ , xxi + 162 pp. Heinemann, 1926. 6/- net.

*Étude sur la pensée de Wells.* Par G. CONNES. 8vo, pp. 500. Hachette, 1926. 25 fr.

*The Jew in Drama.* By M. J. LANDA. Pp. 320. King & Son Ltd., 1925. 12/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Ovid and his Influence.* By EDWARD KENNARD RAND. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome).  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 184 pp. Harrap. 1926. 5s. n.

*Romanticism.* By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE. Pp. 192. Secker, 1926. 6/- net. [A review will appear.]

*Reason and Romanticism: Essays in Literary Criticism.* By HERBERT READ.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 229 pp. Faber and Gwyer. 1926. 7s 6d. n.

*Creative Criticism: Essays on the Unity of Genius and Taste.* By J. E. SPINGARN.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 138 pp. Milford. 1926. 6s. n.

*The Modern Novel: Some Aspects of Contemporary Fiction.* By ELIZABETH A. DREW.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , iv + 274 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*Tradition and Reaction in Modern Poetry.* By LAURENCE BINYON.  $10 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 15 pp. For the English Association. Milford. 1926. 2s. n.

*A Literary Man's London.* By CHARLES G. HARPER.  $9 \times 6$ , 292 pp. Cecil Palmer. 1926. 12s. 6d. n.

#### LANGUAGE.

*The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon.* By A. J. WYATT.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xiv + 126 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1926. 5s. n.

*Petit Manuel de Philologie Anglaise. II: Choix de Textes Anglo-Saxons.* Par PAUL DOTTIN. Pp. 128. Didier, 1926. 12 fr. [See Brief Mention, E.S. June 1926.]

*A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society.* Edited by SIR JAMES A. H. MURRAY, HENRY BRADLEY, W. A. CRAIGIE, and C. T. ONIONS. Vol. X. Ti Z. Unright-Uzzle. By W. A. CRAIGIE.  $13\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{3}{4}$ , pp. 321-493. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926. 15s. n.

*Id. Wavy-Wezzon,* by HENRY BRADLEY and W. A. CRAIGIE, pp. 193-334. 10s. n. Wilga-Wise by C. T. ONIONS, pp. 129-192. 5s. n. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1926.

*A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary.* By J. F. BENSE. Part I., Aam-Dowel.  $25 \times 16\frac{1}{2}$ , c.M. Pp. xxxii + 80. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1926. F. 5.25. [A review will appear.]

*The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire.* By A. MAWER & F. M. STENTON. Pp. xlii + 316. English Place-Name Society, Vol. III., Cambridge University Press, 1926. 18s. net. [A review will appear.]

*The Standard of American Speech, and other papers.* By FRED NEWTON SCOTT.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , v + 345 pp. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.

*The Outlook for American Prose.* By JOSEPH WARREN BEACH.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 284 pp. Chicago: University Press, 1926. 12s. 6d. n.

*S. P. E. Tract no. XXIV. Notes on Relative Causes.* By OTTO JESPERSEN. *American Slang.* By FRED NEWTON SCOTT. 9  $\times$  6, pp. 101-137. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford, 1926. 2s. 6d. n.

*English Speech To-Day.* By BERNARD P. MACDONALD.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 104 pp. Allen and Unwin, 1926. 4s. 6d. n.

*Handbook of English Intonation.* By L. E. ARMSTRONG and I. C. Ward. viii + 124 pp. Leipzig/Berlin, B. G. Teubner, 1926. Geb. M. 4.80. [A review will appear.]

#### HISTORY; BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*History of England.* By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. 9  $\times$  6, xx + 723 pp. Longmans, 1926. 12s. 6d. n.

Strongly recommended.

*England before the Norman Conquest.* By R. W. CHAMBERS. With a Foreword on Roman Britain by M. CARY. 8  $\times$  5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xxvi + 334 pp. Longmans, 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI.* By C. H. SMYTH.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xi + 315 pp. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. 10s. 6d. n.

*Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction.* By JAMES ARTHUR MULLER. 9  $\times$  7, xvi + 429 pp. S. P. C. K. 1926. 15s. n.

*England in Tudor Times: An Account of Its Social Life and Industries.* By L. F. SALZMAN.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , vii + 143 pp. Batsford, 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*The World Encompassed and Analogous contemporary Documents concerning Sir Francis Drake's Circumnavigation of the World. With an Appreciation of the Achievement, by SIR RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE.*  $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ , lxv + 235 pp. Argonaut Press, 57, Haymarket, S.W. 1926. 24s. n.

*Bath under Beau Nash — and After.* By LEWIS MELVILLE. (Revised and extended edition.)  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 240 pp. Nash and Grayson, 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

*Die Englischen Kalenderstäbe.* Von Prof. DR. E. SCHNIPPEL. Mit 8 Tafeln. Pp. 111. [Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster, Heft V.]. Tauchnitz, 1926. M. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*The English Catalogue of Books.* Vol. XI., January, 1921, to December, 1925: Giving in one alphabet, under author, title and subject, the size, price, month and year of publication and publisher of Books issued in the United Kingdom.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , 1,758 pp. Publishers' Circular, 1926. £ 8.8s.

*Classification of London Literature Based upon the Collection in the Guildhall Library.*  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 80 pp. The Library.

This is a most valuable classified guide to the collection of literature, printed and in manuscript, in the Guildhall Library which deals with London, its history, administration, topography, &c. It should be in the hands of all workers in London history. [T]

*Anonyma and Pseudonyma.* By CHARLES A. STONEHILL, ANDREW BLOCK, and H. WINTHROP STONEHILL. Vol. I., A-E.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 543 pp. For subscribers, by C. A. Stonehill, 1926. 105s. n.

*John Galsworthy: An Appreciation together with a Bibliography.*  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ , 22 pp. Heinemann, 1926.

*A Bibliography of Sir Adolphus William Ward.* 1837-1924. By A. T. BARTHOLOMEW. With a Memoir by T. F. TOUT.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxiv + 99 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1926. 7s. 6d. n.

# On the Place of Prepositions.

(Conclusion.)

## VI.

### Adverb Adjuncts of Place. [Indifferent Connection].

27. As in the sections of the preceding chapter back-position of the preposition is also possible, when P + R form an adverb adjunct of place (6 b):

"No, no", said he in talking the matter over with some of his people, *whom he went among*, like a father among his children ('A Noble Life', Mrs. Craik). It is not a precipice *that your house stands on the edge of*<sup>1)</sup> ('Married Life', A. Bennett). We had insisted at all the shops *we had been to*, that the things should be sent with us then and there ('Three Men in a Boat'). It was no strange land *she was in* ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles'). "Why", says he, "that's the house *that I have just come out of*" ('Kidnapped').<sup>2)</sup>

28. Sometimes P + R express place and time, but the idea of place is predominant. In this case back-position of the preposition is equally possible:

I said it (= the supper) was a thing *I wanted to be in at too* ('Three Men in a Boat') She could talk gaily with Ulick about the concert *she had promised to sing at* ('Evelyn Innes', G. Moore).

29. Instead of P + R we often find the relative adverb *where*, so that we get combinations as *the place where*: Is it *Thibet, where* you can do exactly as you feel inclined? *The place where* there are llamas? ('Dodo the Second'). I think we'll go and sit under the tree in *the next field, where* we sat the Sunday Uncle Charlie was there ('Misunderstood', Fl. Montgomery).

30. Sometimes the antecedent is absent before *where*:

Dodo went across the room to *where* a big looking-glass set in the door of her wardrobe reflected her entire figure ('Dodo the Second').

31. The constructions *the place from which he came*, *the place (that, which) he came from*, *the place to which he went*, *the place (that, which) he went to* are easy to explain (see 27). But though the combination *the place from where he came* is not often used, and *the place to where he went* rarely occurs, as far as I know, yet we often find constructions as *(the place) where he came from (a)*, *(the place) where he went to (b)*.<sup>3)</sup> The construction *the place to which he went* has naturally led to *(the place) where he went (c)*.<sup>4)</sup>.

a. "Is that *the place where he comes from*?" he asked. "No, my dear, that is *where he goes to*" (b) ('Dodo the Second'). "Then, will you

<sup>1)</sup> *On the edge of* has the value of a preposition.

<sup>2)</sup> It would seem to me that back-position of *in* is not possible in: She could but pity it with a pity *in which scorn was mingled*. ('The Old Wives' Tale'). I believe that there is a loose connection between *in* and the adjective clause, as the idea of *scorn being mingled* is what we think of in the first place. Hence the idea expressed by the clause is the headword with regard to the adverb adjunct of place *in which* (= in a pity).

<sup>3)</sup> Compare also: Bath is *where my people really belong to* ('The Mayor of Casterbridge').

<sup>4)</sup> See 29, 30.

take it?" (a five-pound note), I asked Miss Mac Cartney. "You saw where it came from" ('Strand Magazine', April, 1916)

b. The widow soon discovered where to come to for counsel and aid ('A Noble Life')

c. This is the place where the news has got to be conveyed ('The Arrow of Gold').<sup>1)</sup>

32. The word *way*, when meaning *direction*, takes no preposition before it (see 6, note 1). This explains the use of combinations as *the way which (that) he went*, which are, however, far less common than *the way he went*, without a connective:

This time he would hold her and never let her go: his thoughts went the way his passion went ('Anne Severn and the Fieldings', May Sinclair).

33. The word *direction* may also occur without a preposition (see 6, note 1), that is why it may be used with the same constructions as *way*. Here, too, the connective is usually absent:

I quite well remember the direction the balloon went ('The Old Wives' Tale').

34. I believe, however, that the combination *the direction in which he went* is far more usual:

He ascertained his bearings as nearly as he could by the sun, moon or stars, and settled in his mind the exact direction in which Casterbridge and Elizabeth Jane lay. ('The Mayor of Casterbridge'). He turned in the direction in which she had been going. ('The Old Wives' Tale').

**Observation.** In the following quotation it is only the relative pronoun that is absent: Is it (= the wind) in the direction you want? ('The Old Wives' Tale').

## VII.

### Adverb Adjuncts of Reason<sup>2)</sup> (Ground, Cause, Origin).

[Indifferent Connection.]

35. In the following quotations P + R form an adverb adjunct of ground (cause) rather than of reason:

He had not even succeeded in outliving his palate — the famous palate that in the fifties men swore by ('The Man of Property'). Supposing he did kill that leopard the other day; the instincts of life it fought with, are governed to a certain extent by fear ('Strand Magazine', October, '18). And those are the people that we have to lick these National Insurance stamps for. ('If Winter Comes', A. S. M. Hutchinson).

36. We find adverb adjuncts of origin in:

Our English business-habits can make or lose ten pounds out of land that Haffican could not make or lose ten shillings out of ('John Bull's Other Island', B. Shaw). I got my wastefulness from the same man I got the buttons from ('Kidnapped'). He is not the man we're buying the stuff from ('London Magazine', January, 1916).

<sup>1)</sup> See also 30.

<sup>2)</sup> Phrases as owing to, because of, on account of etc. cannot have back-position of course (see 10b).

**Observation.** The prepositional adjunct in *I made (lost) ten pounds out of the land* might perhaps be considered as an adverb adjunct of reason or cause.

37. The sentence *the reason for which he came, was another one* cannot be changed into *the reason (that, which) he came for*, etc., which is strange. This may be explained by the fact that the construction *the reason that he came, was another one*, in which *that* is a conjunction introducing a kind of appositional clause, is quite common<sup>1)</sup>:

Do you know *the reason that* we all like to be great? ('Strand Magazine', March 1915). It is not extraordinary that I should want to come here, for *the simple reason that* you are the one woman I ever really cared about ('Dodo the Second')<sup>2)</sup>.

38. In the construction *the reason that he came*, the conjunction is probably psychologically felt as a relative pronoun, which may have led to its occasional absence, so that we get the construction *the reason he came*:

*The reason we all like to think so well of others*, is that we are all afraid of ourselves ('The Picture of Dorian Gray'). A bravo's trade is slaying; but the world has never respected bravos more than merchants: *the reason it honours a soldier*, is, because he holds his life at the service of the state ('Unto this Last', John Ruskin).

39. The combination *the reason for which* has led to *the reason why*, in which *why* is a relative adverb and which runs parallel to *the place where* (see 29):

"There is *no reason why* every family should not have its Ford-car", says an advertisement ('Punch', December '17).

40. Here, too, the antecedent is frequently absent (see 30):

Perhaps this is *why the book seems to me somewhat naïve* ('Punch', December, '21). The fact was that Mrs. Errol had thought it better not to tell him *why this plan had been made* ('Little Lord Fauntleroy', F. H. Burnett).

### VIII.

#### **Adverb Adjuncts of Manner. [Loose Connection].**

41. As early as 1904 Eykman<sup>3)</sup> drew attention to the fact that back-position of the preposition is impossible, when P + R form an adverb adjunct of manner. Sweet mentions the sentence *observe the dignity with which he rises*<sup>4)</sup>, in which P + R form an adjunct of manner, and of which he says: "but even in colloquial speech the construction with preposition + which cannot always be avoided, as in *observe the dignity with which he rises*, where we could not say *the dignity he rises with*, which would, indeed, be unintelligible." But this is of course no solution of the question. In the following quotations back-position of the preposition would be impossible<sup>5)</sup>:

The complacency and the air *with which he stroked his red moustache and side-whiskers*, were insufferable ('Light Freights',

<sup>1)</sup> See Kruisinga, Engl. Acc. and Syntax, 1915, 1925.

<sup>2)</sup> In this sentence we have a real appositional clause, and *that* is not equivalent to *for which*.

<sup>3)</sup> De Drie Talen, 1904, p. 55, ff.

<sup>4)</sup> Vol. II, § 2126.

<sup>5)</sup> Note that the preposition is nearly always *in* or *with*.

W. W. Jacobs). Down he would slide on to the piano, a really fine musical effect being produced by the suddenness *with which his head and body struck all the notes at the same time* ('Three Men in a Boat'). The cruel severity *with which the keepers of the gate of Russia could punish even their own children*, was remembered by him with loathing and contempt ('A Woman of Kronstadt', M. Pemberton). The tone *in which he said 'I thank you kindly'* penetrated Toby's heart. ('The Chimes', Ch. Dickens). Also his demeanour..., his method of handling a knife and fork..., the tone *in which he ordered half a bottle of wine* — all these details infallibly indicated to the company that Matthew Peel Swynnerton was their superior ('The Old Wives' Tale').

42. Yet even in such clauses as have been discussed in the preceding section we occasionally find back-position. This seems to be the case especially with the expression *to greet with*, in which *with* is felt to be more intimately connected with *to greet* than with the (pro)noun with which it forms an adjunct<sup>1)</sup>. Besides, it would seem to me that P + R do not express pure manner in the following quotations, but also attendant circumstances:

Nothing in my life has affected me more than the reception *I've been greeted with to-day*. ('The Prisoner of Zenda', A. Hope). The expression of his face was one of intense surprise, as if laughter was the very last thing *he had expected to be greeted with* ('Three Men in a Boat'). He was scarcely conscious of the polite words of welcome *he greeted the strangers with* ('Almayer's Folly', J. Conrad). You can sing at sight in the key *that it is written in* ('Evelyn Innes').

**Observation.** We may further remind the reader of the fact that in spite of the principles developed in sections 1—8, there is a good deal of uncertainty in the division; that in his mind the speaker or writer often connects the preposition with the predicate though there seems to be a loose connection between these two elements (see section 9). This probably explains the back-position of the preposition *in* in the sentence quoted there. —

43. Back-position of the preposition is of course necessary in comparative clauses introduced by *as* and *than*<sup>2)</sup>, as in: He spoke with more kindness *than he had ever spoken with*, he answered in as kind a tone *as he had ever answered in*.

Cf. "Do you mean to say really", he asked with more cordiality *than he had spoken with for a long time*, "that you see the difference?" ('Vice Versa', F. Anstey).

44. One of the commonest adjuncts of manner is *in this (that, another etc.) way (manner)*. The preposition is often absent before *way* or *manner*<sup>3)</sup>, especially before *way*, which might explain combinations as *\*the way which (that)*<sup>4)</sup> *he did it*. This construction, however, does not occur, though we frequently find *the way he did it* without a connective (see 38):

<sup>1)</sup> Note that *to greet with* has a transitive meaning: to experience, to pronounce (to utter).

<sup>2)</sup> This rule holds good for all kinds of prepositional adjuncts (see 67).

<sup>3)</sup> E.g. I saw him do it *that way*.

<sup>4)</sup> *That* as a relative pronoun of course.

I hate the way you talk about married life ('The Picture of Dorian Gray'). You married Mrs. Omicron doubtless because she was "suitable", but her "suitability" for you consisted in *the way she breathed, the way she crossed the room* ('Married Life').

45. Sometimes, however, it seems not to be recommendable, even hardly possible, to omit *in which* after *way* or *manner*. This seems to be the case when the predicate of the adjective clause is very strongly felt as the headword with regard to the antecedent so that the latter ought not to come in immediate contact<sup>1)</sup> with the clause: He watched *the way in which* she focussed her collecting powers on an object that had no epoch ('The White Monkey', J. Galsworthy). Nothing has amused me so much as *the way in which* she has received my enforced companionship ('The Fowler', B. Harraden).

46. The combination *the way in which (the manner in which)* has naturally led to *the way how (the manner how)*<sup>2)</sup>, which, however, seems to be confined to archaic and poetical language:

I see *no way how* it is possible (Beveridge, Serm. 1680). We perceive not *the ways and manners how* they are produced (Locke, Human Understanding, 1690)<sup>3)</sup>.

47. But constructions in which *way* or *manner* are absent before *how*, are very frequent (see also 30, 40):

If that was *how you served at Fontenoy*, you'd have been better in your berth ('Treasure Island', R. L. Stevenson). When inhumanity walks naked in the sun and stinks to the four winds of heaven, I shall judge a man by *how he judges of it* (G. K. Chesterton, Ill. L. News, Febr. '24). The thought of *how he would welcome me*, the only human being that he had seen for years, had a certain fascination for me ('Should we say what we think?': 'Idle Ideas of 1905', J. K. Jerome).

48. *Way* and *manner* may be followed by the conjunction *that*, which then introduces a kind of appositional clause. This combination runs parallel to *the reason that* (37):

Kala Nag, which means Black Snake, had served the Indian Government in *every way that an elephant could serve it for 47 years* (quoted from Kruisinga's Engl. Acc. & Syntax).

**Observation I.** The antecedent is, of course, an object in:

He thought Lucas had matured in a way that *his early frothiness had never led him to anticipate* ('The Two Flames', M. Maas).

**Observation II.** The use of *as* after *the same way* may be explained by the fact that *same* is felt as the headword with regard to the clause rather than *way*. Absence of *same* would lead to the use of the conjunction *that*<sup>4)</sup>, which might be suppressed in its turn (see 44):

The "S" of Sophia was formed in *the same way as* she had formed it in the last letter.... ('The Old Wives' Tale').

49. Certain words as *sense*, *spirit*, *tone*, are sometimes felt to have the same meaning as *way* or *manner*, and then require the same constructions. Thus back-position of *in* would be impossible in the following sentences,

<sup>1)</sup> By this immediate contact it would have too much the character of a psychological subject.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. *the place where, the reason why*.

<sup>3)</sup> Both examples have been quoted from N. E. D.

<sup>4)</sup> Or of course to the use of *in which*.

while the use of the conjunction *that* or the absence of a connective would make correct English:

There was no mistaking *the sense in which* she meant him to understand the word "summer" ('Dodo the Second'). Do you really think I would marry you if you consented, (to marry me) in *the spirit in which* you are taking him (*Ibid.*).

We find no connective in the following sentence, where the combination *in which* or the conjunction *that* might introduce the clause:

He said it rather mumbly. Exactly in *that tone she used to say* things like 'I do like you in that brown suit, Marko' ('If Winter Comes', A. S. M. Hutchinson).

## IX.

### Adverb Adjuncts of Time. [Loose Connection].

50. When P + R form an expression of pure time, back-position of the preposition is likewise impossible. Thus front-position is necessary in:

The moment was one *at which her father's sense of the antique nobility of the family was highest*. ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles'). It was Easter-tide, a time *at which the ferment of men's passions was at its highest*. ('The Two Flames', M. Maas). Indeed, he could scarcely remember any Sunday *on which the church had been so crowded* ('Little Lord Fauntleroy', F. H. Burnett). I feel so young on the very day *on which I should most naturally be thinking* what a lot of life has passed ('Dodo the Second'). As if the growth of that, as well as of natural bodies, had some short periods beyond which it could reach, and *after which it must begin to decay* ('Essays', Sir W. Temple).

**Observation.** We know that *during* (and *pending*) cannot have back-position, according to 10a: Then, after a short silence, *during which she looked away*, she leant forward, touched his arm and said with entreaty: "Be kind about it" ('The Vineyard', J. O. Hobbes). His business does not absorb at the outside more than seventy hours of the hundred and ten hours *during which he is wide awake* ('Married Life').

51. Very often P + R do not express pure time. The idea of time, for instance, is very often mixed up with that of place, in which case back-position of the preposition is possible when the idea of place is predominant (28). If, however, the adjunct expresses time rather than place, back-position is not possible:

I've never been awake; life, since we parted, has been one long sweet siesta, *in which your image was ever foremost* ('Our Boys', H. J. Byron<sup>1</sup>).

**Observation.** In the last quotation of section 50, there is an adjective clause, introduced by *beyond which*. This adjunct expresses both time and place, but place rather than time<sup>2</sup>), so that back-position of *beyond* would be all right. However, it should be avoided here, in order not to mar the unity of the sentence.

<sup>1</sup>) Note also that this clause is continuative; that the idea of place is expressed by *in which*, is proved by the fact that it may be replaced by *where*.

<sup>2</sup>) Mark the word *reach*!

52. It frequently happens that P+R express both time and attendant circumstances. In this case back-position of the preposition is often found:

The age *we live in*, is bound to excite a stinging and sardonic humour in everybody ('Everyman', April 25, '16). His taste of books is a little too just for the age *he lives in* ('The Spectator Club', R. Steele).

53. The preposition being frequently absent before adjuncts of time, we might expect to find constructions as *\*the day which (that) I saw him*, *\*the moment which (that) he arrived*<sup>1)</sup> (see 37, 38, 44), which however is not the case. However, we do find constructions with the conjunction *that* (a), or without a connective (b), in the same way as after *reason* and *way*:

a. And perhaps it is at such moments that *national opinion comes nearest to unanimity on this burning topic* ('Punch', January 18, '22)<sup>2)</sup>. You can't ask that now, in the first moment *that you tell me of it* ('What Every Woman Knows', Sir J. M. Barrie). Every minute *that she let Maisie go on loving and trusting and believing in her*, she lied ('Anne Severn and the Fieldings', May Sinclair).

b. She introduced us to a young man who had been wounded in France, and by the time *he returned home*, had lost his mother, his brother, his only child and his wife ('Punch', December 14, 1921). The moment *I met you*, I saw that you were quite unconscious of what you are. ('The Picture of Dorian Gray'). I think we'll go and sit under the tree in the next field, where we sat the Sunday *Uncle Charles was there* ('Misunderstood', Fl. Montgomery).

54. In the same way as we have the combinations *the place where*, *the reason why*, *the way how*, we find *the day when*, *the moment when*, etc. in which *when* is a relative adverb (see the corresponding sections):

There were times *when it appeared to Dorian Gray* that the whole of history was merely the record of his own life ('The Picture of Dorian Gray'). For Lucas the night passed in Jerome's company, was the prelude to a wonderful friendship, a period *when his friend shared his own original views and mind* ('The Two Flames', Mabel Maas).

55. Like *where*, *why* and *how*, the word *when* frequently occurs without an antecedent:<sup>3)</sup>

"Nonsense, my love". I replied. "I never mind *when Blayton comes*" ('Cassell's Magazine', September, '22: 'The Grape Cure', George Robey). 'T was *when the seas were roaring* / With hollow blasts of wind / A damsel lay deplored / All on a rock reclined ('A Ballad', John Gay).

56. Sometimes both the antecedent and the connective (*when* or *that*) are absent, but then there is some other word in the head-sentence expressing time:

The tyrannic routine begins *instantly he is out of bed* ('Married Life'). Life begins *instantly he has got up*<sup>4)</sup> ('Punch', December 14, '21).

57. We may also draw the reader's attention to the words *time* (= one moment or period of a series of moments or periods), which is nearly always

<sup>1)</sup> With *that* as a relative pronoun.

<sup>2)</sup> Back-position, if possible, is found in apparent adjective clauses as well (see Kruisinga, Engl. Acc. and Syntax, 1984, etc.).

<sup>3)</sup> Of course also after the formal subject *it* + the verb *to be*.

<sup>4)</sup> In both examples *that* as well as *when* might be inserted.

followed by *that* (conjunction) or *when*, or which occurs without a connective<sup>1</sup>) (*a*); and *occasion*, which though the adjunct *on that occasion*<sup>2</sup>) expresses attendant circumstances as well as time, is never followed by an adjective clause with back-position of *on*, but by clauses introduced by *on which*, *that* (conjunction), *when* or by clauses without a connective (*b*).

- a. Every *time that* she made an effort, she knew intimately and speedily that the doctor was right ('The Old Wives' Tale'). Every *time when* it (= the pain) came, she thought she should die of it ('Anne Severn and the Fieldings'). It was the first *time she had spoken on the subject with spirit* ('The Two Flames', M. Maas).
- b. The last two *occasions on which* I was allowed to see my friends there, I tried to be as cheerful as possible ('De Profundis', O. Wilde). It's precisely on these *occasions that* no inspiration is ever attainable ('Punch', January 18, '22). On those rare *occasions when* I become possessed of one (= a five-pound note), I rush off as fast as ever I can to change it ('Strand Magazine', April, '16). The last *occasion I saw him*, he was a human wreck ('The Two Flames').

## X.

### Adverb Adjuncts of Condition and Concession. [Loose Connection].

58. P + R occasionally form an adverb adjunct of condition: then back-position of the preposition does not occur. Thus *on* could not be placed after *them* in:

It was not for them to arrange the terms *on which* the superior families would visit them ('Emma', Miss Austen).

59. I think that P + R can never be an adverb adjunct of concession, at least if P is a short preposition as *with*, *for*. And the longer prepositions *notwithstanding*, *(in) spite of*, *despite* cannot have back-position, not only because they express concession, but also for the reasons explained in section 10 (*a*, *b*).

## XI.

### Back-position of the Preposition the Consequence of its Adverbial Character.

60. In the quotations of the preceding sections the preposition has more or less the character of an adverb (see 2); but there are examples in which it has lost its character almost altogether, and can hardly be connected with a (pro)noun. We have already seen that there is a strong tendency for prepositions to be converted into adverbs (see 13). This tendency is frequently found in adjective clauses introduced by an anaphoric relative pronoun, and in which it would hardly do to give front-position to the preposition because of its adverbial character. Thus back-position seems to be preferable for the reasons explained, in the following quotations:

The only people *I would care to be with*, are artists and people who have suffered ('De Profundis', O. Wilde). It's a case *I can't*

<sup>1</sup>) A preposition + *which* hardly ever, if ever, occurs after this word *time*.

<sup>2</sup>) When this adjunct modifies a predicate there seems to be loose connection between *on* and this predicate.

advise you in ('Evan Harrington'). There were five doors that I looked through ('The Countess Cathleen', W. B. Yeats). The Foyle was a sheet of waving molten gold, which the boat cut through, as she sped out from the pier ('The Children of the Dead End', P. Mc. Gill.<sup>1)</sup>.

## XII.

### Special Cases in which Back-position of the Preposition is impossible.

61. Back-position of the preposition is of course not found, if it would make the sense unintelligible. It is naturally impossible to lay down rules for this case or to develop principles: the construction of each separate sentence points to the necessity of the front-position.

62. Sometimes such clauses are continuative or belong to the group that are neither continuative nor restrictive, so that for this reason already back-position should be avoided. But even apart from this fact back-position would make the meaning unintelligible in:

The recess beneath the counter, *in which his flock mattress was thrust*, looked like a grave ('Oliver Twist', Ch. Dickens). <sup>2)</sup> His sense of constraint was changing into a positive dread, and not at all of Julian, *around whom he had believed that his thoughts were in flight* ('Flames', R. Hichens). <sup>3)</sup> The Nile was a broad path of glory, *on which the shadowy boats lay in magical flotillas* ('An Imaginative Man', R. Hichens). <sup>4)</sup> I had taken as my types not merely the shepherd on the hillside, and the prisoner in his cell, but also the painter, *to whom the world is a pageant*, and the poet, *for whom the world is a song* ('De Profundis'). <sup>5)</sup>

63. But also in restrictive clauses we find that back-position is sometimes impossible because it would make the meaning unintelligible:

The gown had not seen the light for twenty years, saving and excepting such truant rays as had stolen through the chinks of the box *in which it had been laid by during the whole time* ('Pickwick Papers') <sup>6)</sup>. Sedate and solemn was the score of rubbers *in which Mr. Pickwick and the old lady played together* (*Ibid.*) <sup>7)</sup> But it is of vital importance that the public should not be deceived into the belief that any international system can be devised *under which it will be safe for this country to depend upon any power*

<sup>1)</sup> The adjective clause of the last quotation is continuative. See also Kruisinga, Engl. Accidence and Syntax (2204).

<sup>2)</sup> Back-position of *in* would suggest the phrase *to thrust in*, in which *in* would be an adverb, which would make nonsense.

<sup>3)</sup> The complexity of the sentence, which would lead to *around* being placed after *were in flight*, to which it does not at all belong, may be the reason that the preposition cannot be separated from *whom*.

<sup>4)</sup> The place of *on* after *lay* in this dignified sentence, would produce a ridiculous effect.

<sup>5)</sup> See the preceding note.

<sup>6)</sup> By putting *in* after *by*, we should get the succession *by in during*. Back-position would be very well possible, if *laid by* where replaced by *hidden*.

<sup>7)</sup> Back-position of *in* would lead to the conclusion that *rubbers* is the headword with regard to the clause, which it is not, for the author wishes to draw the attention to the *number* of rubbers. (Mark the concord between *was* and *score*.)

than its own ('Times Lit. Suppl.', Jan. 20, '16)<sup>1</sup>). I was conducted upstairs to a room in which were the *Emperor and Josephine* ('Uncle Bernac', Conan Doyle).<sup>1</sup> You can wind up the evening's entertainment by showing yourself (= the Kaiser) making a speech in which you can bring in those words about the good old German God, who has always been your ally ('Punch', May 17, '16).<sup>1</sup> I was not in the sphere in which such belief was to be attained to ('De Profundis').<sup>2</sup> This is a subject on which I flatter myself I really am au fait ('On being Idle', J. K. Jerome).<sup>3</sup>

### XIII.

#### Cases in which Back-position of the Preposition is necessary.

64. Up to now we have spoken about cases where back-position is possible or not possible; now we will treat a few cases where it is necessary. When we take this sentence *he is man whom I respect too much to laugh at*, we find that *whom* is the direct object of *to respect*, and that it necessarily belongs to the headpart of the adjective clause. But we also see that *whom* denotes at the same time the object of *to laugh at*, which however is dependent on the headpart as an adverb adjunct of purpose or result. The preposition belongs to this infinitive and cannot have front-position, because then it would seem as if it also belonged to *I respect*:

Cf. We took with us . . . our large water-bottles with weak cold tea, which I have always thought the best stuff to shoot on ('King Solomon's Mines', R. Haggard). "Oh, that's my money", explained Humphrey "that I am saving to buy Old Dyson an ear-trumpet with" ('Misunderstood').

**Observation I.** The following sentence is construed in the same way: Marian had felt uneasy about Tess, whom she could not get near enough to speak to ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles'). *To* cannot have front-position, but we might insert another preposition *to* belonging to *near enough*, in which case *to speak to* would have to be followed by *him*, so that the construction would be: whom she could not get near enough to to speak to him, or: to whom she could not get near enough to speak to him.

**Observation II.** When the relative pronoun has nothing to do with the headpart of the adjective clause, but belongs only to the infinitive, the preposition that follows the infinitive may be placed before the relative pronoun, as in: he is the boy whom I have come to speak of (= of whom I have come to speak). Cf. Over the earliest work of the artist whom we are here to to take note of<sup>4</sup>), that purblind leader of the blind presided on the whole for evil ('The Life and Death of Jason', Swinburne).

<sup>1</sup>) In these three sentences the construction would become quite nonsensical through the back-position of the preposition. In the first and third this is chiefly owing to the complexity of the sentence.

<sup>2</sup>) Back-position is not possible, because there is already an unstressed preposition at the end. When the predicate ends in a stressed adverb, back-position is possible: I said it (= supper) was a thing I wanted to be in at too ('Three Men in a Boat').

<sup>3</sup>) On after the French expression *au fait*, with which it would be closely connected, would make a strange impression there and would form an unusual combination.

<sup>4</sup>) The meaning is evidently: we are here to take note of him, so that *of* may also be placed before *whom*.

65. Back-position of the preposition is of course also necessary, when the adjective clause is compound, i.e. consists of two co-ordinate parts, the second of which ends in a preposition: in this case there is no relation between P and R:

I used to frequent a little obscure café, and the person to whom I mentioned the idea — and I am sure he was the only person I ever did mention it to, was a German, whom I used to meet there casually and sometimes played chess with ('Strand Mag.', April '16: 'The King's Enemies', Raymond Allen). It (viz. Christmas) is the festival of birth, which we can all understand and rejoice in ('Times Literary Supplement', Dec. 23, '15). On the other hand, the architect's devotion to his idea, to the image of a house which he had created and believed in — had made him nervous of being stopped ('The Man of Property'). But he felt that he was with a living presence, with a great enigma that he could never understand, never draw near to ('An Imaginative Man').... the propriety of requesting some of his rich and titled acquaintance to confer on him the favour of their patronage. Which they would not repent and might learn to be very much obliged to him for. ('Evan Harrington'). I have never forgotten the woman I betrayed and broke my promise to ('Sweet Lavender', Pinero).

**Observation.** When the adjective clause is compound and the preposition belongs to the first part, it cannot have back-position in the second of course; nor can it have front-position, for then it would seem to belong to both the first and the second part: An ordinary slip or lapse that a young man may be guilty of and desire to forget, can be reckoned on if properly treated to encompass his disgrace later on ('The Two Flames').

66. Sometimes an adjective clause ends in a phrase of which the last word is a preposition and which has the value of a preposition. In this case the whole phrase may have front-position (if there is no reason why this should be impossible), but the preposition by itself cannot have front-position, or at least front-position is rare. Thus we could hardly or not at all place the preposition at the beginning of the adjective clause in:

Oh, what a star of the first magnitude / Were poor young Fazio,  
if his skill should work / The wondrous secret your deep-closeted  
sages / Grow grey in dreaming of ('Fazio', W. H. Milman).  
He spoke with the broad south-country tongue which I was begining to weary for the sound of ('Kidnapped'). The Michaels and Raphaels you hum and buzz round the works of (Browning, quoted from Onions, An. Adv. Engl. Syntax, 112b). It is not a precipice that your house stands on the edge of ('Married Life').

67. In clauses introduced by *as* and *than*, we naturally have back-position of the preposition, also when there is a loose connection between the predicate and the preposition (see 43):

a. At length he was observed.... to enter a large worn-out building such as there exist specimens of in Chancery Lane ('Christ's Hospital', Ch. Lamb). Dodo was seated in the room.... In intervals ringing up on the telephone as many of her friends as she could remember the names of ('Dodo the Second'). Life is nothing.... but work in the week with as much beer and tobacco as the money will run to ('All Sorts and Conditions of Men', Sir W. Besant). I have never seen any such apparition as

*you speak of* ('The Pointing Finger', Rita). There dawned a light such as the light of day was unto but as a little lamp unto the sun ('Three Men in a Boat')<sup>1)</sup>

b. She loved him when she thought him guilty, which made her conceive that her love was of a diviner cast than Rose was capable of ('Evan Harrington'). "That is one more than you ever cared for", remarked Nadine ('Dodo the Second'). I shall have glory by this losing day, / More than Octavius and Mark Antony / By this vile conquest shall attain unto ('Julius Caesar', W. Shakespeare). "Do you mean to say really", he asked with more cordiality than he had spoken with for a long time, "that you see the difference?" ('Vice Versa', F. Anstey).

68. There is one more interesting case in which back-position of the preposition is required: that is when the adjective clause has a passive predicate that ends in a preposition. The relative pronoun, which is the subject of this passive predicate, can naturally not be preceded by a preposition:

The river passes Greenlands, the residence of my newsagent — a quiet unassuming old gentleman, who may often be met with about these regions ('Three Men in a Boat'). Unto this man, who hath been sung of in the Psalms and foretold by all the Prophets — unto him will I join myself ('The Diary of Judas Iscariot', G. A. Page). I could not turn round to see whose nose it was that was to be looked at ('Three Men in a Boat').<sup>2)</sup>

**Observation.** It should be noted that active gerunds with a passive meaning, after *worth* and such verbs as *to want*, *to require*, etc. follow the same rule: I should think there'll be a lot that'll want seeing to ('Three Men in a Boat'). It's your strong chaps that require looking after ('Sweet Lavender', Pinero). She.... escaped from Sir Owen, leaving him, as she knew, under the impression that she was a little fool not worth taking further trouble about ('Evelyn Innes', G. Moore).<sup>3)</sup>

#### XIV.

#### Clauses introduced by an Independent Relative Pronoun.

69. Very often the independent relative pronouns *what* and *whom*, when preceded by a preposition, have the meaning of *that which*, *him who(m)*. When the preposition belongs to the antecedent-pronoun, it is logically a part of the head-sentence and can have no back-position in the clause (a). But when it belongs to the relative pronoun, it may have back-position in the clause, when there is close or indifferent connection (b):

- a. I can't walk along the streets, Sybil, without looking in all the shop windows for what I think would become you best ('What Every Woman Knows', Sir J. M. Barrie).<sup>4)</sup>
- b. I have been living on in a lackadaisical way and have not seen

<sup>1)</sup> Several of the dependent clauses have the character of adjective clauses.

<sup>2)</sup> Apparent adjective clauses after the formal subject *it* and the verb *to be* are again included.

<sup>3)</sup> In this sentence the rel. pron and *to be* are absent before *worth*.

<sup>4)</sup> The parenthetical clause *I think* has the value of a head-sentence with regard to the rest of the clause, which is its object.

*what it may lead to* ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles'). That is just *what there is very little of in Defoe* ('The English Novel', Prof. Saintsbury).<sup>1)</sup>

70. When the independent relative pronoun has not the value of an antecedent pronoun + a relative pronoun (after *to ask*, *to wonder*, *to know*, *to understand* etc.) it belongs to the clause, as in: I know whom you spoke of (= of whom you spoke), I asked what he was laughing at (= at what he was laughing).<sup>2)</sup> In these constructions it is the whole clause that must be considered as the object of *to know* and *to ask*, and we do not feel such sentences as: I know him whom you spoke of, I asked that which he was laughing at — to be equivalent to the others.<sup>3)</sup> In the constructions that we are discussing, there may be either front- or back-position of the preposition when there is close or indifferent connection between P and R: I wondered *what he was laughing at* ('The World's Great Books', Tartarin of Tarascon).

71. But there are sentences where front-position would be impossible. This is the case when the rel. pron. is a predicative adjunct to the subject of a passive clause, as in: The Deuce only knows *what I am thought of by my brethren* ('Tess of the D'Urbervilles'). Evidently *of* has nothing to do with *what*, no more than *a fool* (a predicative adjunct to *him*) has anything to do with *of* in: They thought of him *as a fool*.

72. Also when the preposition has got the character of an adverb, front-position is impossible:

I don't know *what it is they are behind* ('Love Among the Lions', F. Anstey).<sup>4)</sup> Not a word had been heard of it before I left, and some days had to pass before I comprehended *what it was all about* ('Oceana', J. A. Froude).

Rotterdam.

R. VOLBEDA.

## English Grammar as She is Taught at Oxford.

In announcing the pamphlet of the English Association on what was grandly called *The Problem of Grammar* (Pamphlet no. 56, 1923) I expressed my conviction that "for continental readers there (was) nothing to be learnt from this report except that it may show those who are inclined to doubt the use of a thorough study of language what the results are of its neglect" (*English Studies* V, p. 219). That I am not alone in my view of the effects of the neglect of language study in England seems to be clear from the preface to Professor Wyld's little book on *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope* published in the same year; he declares that, "in spite of all the universities now existing in this country, linguistic knowledge and training among the majority of highly cultivated persons are at a very low ebb." If this should be meant to imply, however, that it is the newer universities that are found wanting there would be reason for an energetic protest; for the ancient English universities, where classical studies are

<sup>1)</sup> The preposition may have front-position.

<sup>2)</sup> The clauses between brackets are literary of course.

<sup>3)</sup> See Sweet, *New English Grammar* I, 221 ff.

<sup>4)</sup> In this clause *what* is emphasized by means of the formal subject *it* and the verb to *be*; but the absence of *it is* would cause no difference in the construction.

predominant, are the last places from which improvement is likely to be forthcoming. Here again I will quote a proof that I am not advancing private opinions. In the June number of the American periodical *Language* Professor Bolling in a review of the first part of the new edition of Liddell and Scott complains of the neglect of the results of linguistic study in the new dictionary, rejecting the absurd defence of this attitude by the new editor and showing some of its consequences. What the effect of the neglect is on books dealing with the native language, is shown in an interesting fashion by the book by Mr. Fowler reviewed in this number. We choose this book because it is no doubt one of the "best" specimens of its kind. Its merits as a book of idiom have been done justice to by the reviewer; if books on idiom are required, which I venture to doubt, it may do good. But the book also contains some articles on grammar; what it is possible to perpetrate on this subject, and that in a book published by a University Press, and a press that had the honour to publish the work of a scholar like Sweet, will probably surprise many of our readers. It may also be instructive, showing how things should not be done.

The success of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* has encouraged the author in a belief that he is qualified to write on all that appertains to English language study. Now it is true that the dictionary has not only been successful, but that it has been so deservedly. The writing of dictionaries, however, is a peculiar trade; it requires some knowledge, no doubt, even if it concerns itself with the colloquial language of the present day; but zeal, practical sense, a talent of organization, and material support are probably more important. Experience has shown that good dictionaries have been written by men whose scientific knowledge of the language concerned was extremely limited, limited that is to... words. It would be unkind to quote examples; one would really seem ungrateful for work that is of great use to scholars, and can have brought no reward to the writer, unless in a material sense. The complaints that dictionary-making is one of the most ungrateful tasks are certainly well-founded. But it is certain that the writer of a good dictionary is often not a good grammarian, or even not a grammarian at all. Mr. Fowler, unfortunately, is no exception; to him a grammarian may be all sorts of things but never what he ought to be in our opinion: a student of language.

In some of his articles Mr. Fowler shows us the Grammarian as Moralist. This side of the subject is well instanced by the article on the perfect infinitive. He does not examine the facts of the use of the perfect infinitive, as a normal grammarian would do. No, he starts from a theory how things *ought to be*: the perfect infinitive ought to be used only to express past time. Hence it is justifiable in *He seems to have worked hard*. All other uses are wrong, and evidently so; for all other uses are contrary to the definition of the function of the perfect infinitive. If a pupil should ask why the perfect infinitive "ought to" express past time the only remedy is for the English schoolmaster to whip the boy, just as he would whip a boy who should ask why it is wrong to tell a lie.<sup>1)</sup> Such things are beyond discussion. That I am not exaggerating is shown by the following quotation: "After the past tense of *hope*, *fear*, *expect*, and the like, the perfect infinitive is used, incorrectly indeed and unnecessarily, but so often and with so useful an implication that it may well be counted

<sup>1)</sup> In such a backward country as Holland corporal punishment in schools has been abolished.

idiomatic." This means, evidently, that the sin is too common for the author to have any hope of extirpating it; he therefore brands it with the stigma of idiomatic, not really grammatical. The author reminds one of clergymen who would like to forbid the women of their congregation to adopt the new fashions of short skirts, short sleeves (or none) and short hair, but are compelled to resort to ignominious compromises. The author also disapproves of the infinitive with *to aim*; to speak or to write of "men aiming to advance in life" is sinful. Hence the author calls it an Americanism, which among grammarians of this type is the most serious charge that can be brought against a construction. And it is so convenient because there is a silent agreement among these gentlemen that no proof of the charge is ever needed. It is of no importance, therefore, that the instance I have just given is quoted from Mr. Thomas Hardy, and that an instance from Leslie Stephen is to be found in my *Handbook* on p. 226. To expect Mr. Fowler to consult a book of a real grammarian, even if no benighted foreigner, is misunderstanding his state of mind completely. One more quotation, and we will pass on to another aspect. Mr. Fowler declares that *whoever can it be?* is illiterate, and *who ever can it be?* is colloquial only. No reasons are given, and I confess that I am unable to guess at them in this case. But I do understand that the spacing between *who* and *ever* makes all the difference between illiteracy and colloquiality. If a reader should ask why the spacing is so important I can only answer that it is a mystery of space; let him refer the question to Einstein.

The grammarian is not only a moralist, however. We are also introduced to the Grammarian as Policeman. In the article on *Cases* we are informed, that "if the novelists are to be trusted<sup>1)</sup>, the uneducated find the case-endings even of pronouns superfluous. Me and my mate likes ends...." The learned author concludes his valuable observations as follows: "and that the right policy is to let the memory of case fade away as soon as we can agree whether *I* or *me*, *she* or *her*, *who* or *whom*, is to be the survivor of the pair? Possibly it is." The author has clearly never heard of conjoint and absolute forms; but what is most instructive of all, is that he honestly imagines the disappearance of cases to be dependent on agreement. One wonders what his idea is of the origin of language. Possibly that, too, is the product of an agreement.

In the article on the Double Passive we are shown the Grammarian as a Judge of Style. "*The point is sought to be evaded*: monstrosities of this kind, which are as repulsive to the grammarian as to the stylist perhaps spring by false analogy from the superficially similar type seen in *The man was ordered to be shot*. But the simple forms from which they are developed are dissimilar: *They ordered the man to be shot*; but *They seek to evade the point*.... Some of the verbs most maltreated in this way are *attempt*, *begin*, *desire*, *endeavour*, *hope*, *intend*, *propose*, *purpose*, *seek*, *threaten*,..." The author is so pleased that the stylist for once agrees with the grammarian (i.e. himself) that he returns to the attack in the article on *hope*. But he makes no attempt to find out why the construction should be limited to the verbs he enumerates. For there is no similarity of meaning between these and the verbs that take an accusative and infinitive to which he refers. It is clear, however, that the verbs mentioned (*attempt*, *begin*, etc.) are all such as take an infinitive that must be looked upon as closely

<sup>1)</sup> Mr. Fowler has no ears to hear, evidently. Or does he magically make any one he meets an educated speaker?

related to an object, and may be called a *complementary infinitive*. Let us take the example *They attempted to systematize the whole*. The infinitive, being in many respects an object, can become the subject of a passive construction. As an infinitive is never so completely an object as a noun, however, it does not open the passive sentence, but the so-called provisional *it* is used. The result is: *It was attempted to systematize the whole*. Sentences of this type will probably not be objected to by any "stylist". They are, at any rate, ordinary English. If, now, we consider the function of *the whole* in this passive sentence, it seems reasonable to say that it is the object of the whole verbal group, not of the infinitive only. If this is so, it is natural for people who have the correct feeling or instinct for this relation, to make *the whole* the subject of the corresponding passive construction when it is the thought that first occurs to them, the idea about which they wish to tell something; and the result is: *The whole was attempted to be systematized*. My explanation may be right, and it may be wrong; one thing is certain, however: if the construction answers to a real need, as I think it does, no number of grammarians' bulls will avail. The belief in the infallibility of grammarians is limited to a small class, viz. to that of grammarians of the type of Mr. Fowler. And even these may be suspected of offering lip-service only.

The most interesting side of the articles must now be shown: the Grammarian as Conjurer. The first article, which really strikes the keynote to all the grammatical articles, is about the form of the indefinite article. We are informed that *a* is used "before all consonants except silent *h* (*a history, an hour*)."<sup>1)</sup> When one remembers that stops have been defined as essentially pauses, one understands that deep phonetic knowledge, too deep for words, may be hidden here. A person who can hear the sound of silence is surely a born phonetician. The author's conjuring tricks are also shown in the article on Relative Pronouns. Of course he classifies relative clauses as defining and non-defining; it is not to be expected that he should ever have heard of the non-defining clauses as including two very different kinds. But he is able, in spite of that, to write about *that* with genuine feeling: "It cannot endure that a preposition governing *it* should, by coming before it, part it from the antecedent or the main sentence." Does not the reader seem to hear the author's little boy exclaiming: I won't go if Daddy won't carry me? But the note on *that* contains still more curiosities: "Another peculiarity of *that* is that in the defining clauses to which it is proper it may, if it is not the subject, be omitted and yet operative."<sup>1)</sup> (*The man you saw means the same as The man that you saw*). If a man can show a word that is not there to be operative, what else can you call him but a conjurer?

A climax is certainly impossible. In spite of this, I will add what we find about *Fused Participles*. It may be an anti-climax, abhorred by the "stylist", but it will be instructive. Mr. Fowler is horrified at *I like you pleading poverty* (it should be *your*); *We need fear nothing from China developing her resources* (Mr. Fowler suggests *China's*); *which will result in many having to go into lodgings* (Mr. Fowler proposes *many's*); *to deny the possibility of anything happening* (it seems it ought to be *anything's*). And if any reader should be so disrespectful as to want a reason, Mr. Fowler is prepared, this time, to give an answer instead of proposing the whipping I referred to at the beginning. He gives a "test case": *Women*

<sup>1)</sup> Note the double function of *be*.

having the vote reduces men's power. Even if this test case is really ordinary English, it evidently proves little; for it is chiefly when the gerund is not the subject opening the sentence that the construction to which Mr. Fowler objects, is found. But that is a detail which our grammarian neglects, like all other "details" that scholars are concerned with.

We must conclude. If Oxford chooses to continue to neglect the scientific study of English it is not for us to find fault. We are prepared to leave Oxford people in peace; but they should avoid one thing: they should not set up as guides to foreigners, as they do in this work, which is evidently meant for foreign consumption too. And if they strictly adhere to the principle of not studying language they should also put up with its consequence: they should avoid writing about it. If they refuse to accept this practical consequence they will necessarily make themselves the laughing-stock of those who know, just as a man who writes about chemistry without knowing anything about it will find out to his cost. But, fortunately, he will not find a publisher, not even at Oxford.

E. KRUISINGA.

## Notes and News.

**"That alle myghtys may" in the Towneley Secunda Pastorum.** In the well known second Shepherds' Play in the Towneley cycle Tercius Pastor says:

Fulle glad may we be, and abyde that day  
That lufly to se, that alle myghtys may.

These are lines 694-5 of the edition of this play in *English Miracle Plays* by Alfred W. Pollard, corresponding to lines 683-4 of most other editions, e.g. that of the Early English Text Society, E. S., 71. Now on turning to Pollard's Glossarial Index we find only one entry of the word *may*, with a reference to this identical passage, viz.

*May, sb. maid, virgin. T. 695.*

I have seen this entry in the first edition (of 1890), in the fourth, and in the latest, the seventh, of 1923, so that for more than thirty-five years a good many of the thousands of people who have used Pollard's book may be supposed to have construed the above passage as follows:

Full glad may we be, and abide that day  
To see that lovely one, that almighty maid,

i. e. the Virgin Mary, mother of the newborn Saviour.

I am not aware that anybody has ever called attention, in print, to this faulty rendering; so it may be worth while to point out that in the above two lines the third shepherd does not ascribe omnipotence to the Virgin Mary, but to God, or rather to the Man-God, Jesus Christ. For it seems hardly doubtful that the word *may*, though very often used in Middle English, also in the Towneley cycle, as a *noun*, meaning 'maid', 'virgin', is not a noun here at all, but a *verb*, meaning 'to be able', 'to have power'.

As a first proof for this interpretation I adduce lines 485-7 of the first Shepherds' Play of Towneley, to be found on page 115 of the EETS edition, where Mary is represented thanking the shepherds for their visit and saying to them:

He that all myghtys may, the makere of heuen,  
That is for to say, my son that I neuen,  
Rewarde you this day

which, of course, means: He that can [do] all mights, i. e. He that has almighty power, the maker of heaven, my son namely, reward you this day.

Another very clear passage may be quoted from Towneley, p. 185, lines 130-2. They are again words of Mary:

Lord, that all myghtys may,  
Gyf vs grace to do this day  
That it be pleasyng to the.

I append a few instances from other Middle English works, which will show that this phrase and similar ones were pretty common in medieval times:

God, þat all þis myhtes may,  
In heuene and erþe þy wille ys oo.

(Harl. MS. 2253, f. 106a; ed. by K. Böddeker,  
*Altengl. Dichtungen*; see p. 222).

Sone, she seyd, blyssyd þou be,  
As lord þat all myghtes may!

(Harl. MS. 3954. — See Horstmann's *Altengl. Legenden*, 1878, p. 102).

Of mercy I þe biseche: þat mest of mihtes may,  
Swete Jhesu my cumfort: mi solas and my play.

(Minor Poems of the Vernon MS. I, ed. by  
Horstmann, EETS., O.S., No. 98, p. 29).

God that all myties may,  
Helps us at our ending daye.

(Title of a song on p. 5. of: *Songs and Carols from a MS. in the British Museum*, ed. by Th. Wright for the Warton Club, 1856.)

Now that Lorde, thatt best may,  
He be your sped in youre journey.

(Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays, EETS.,  
E.S., no. 87. p. 49.)

Thanne byde we here and pray  
Besekyng hym of comfort that best may.

(Ludus Coventriæ, EETS., E.S., no. 120, p. 370.)

A number of instances of the last quoted form of the phrase ('that best may') are to be found in *The Visions of Tundale* . . . . , ed. by W. Turnbull from MS. Advocates Library Jac. V, 7, 27. See especially pp. 153-4.

What is 'mihtes' in the expression 'he that all mihtes may': a genitive singular (so that it might be construed as an adverbial genitive) or a plural? The Oxford Dictionary decides in favour of the latter, calling it a cognate object of the verb of complete predication *may*. See p. 257, col. 2, no I. 1. b. There can be no doubt about its being such an object in some of the quotations given by the Oxf. D., and so we shall probably not be far wrong in saying that it is a plural cognate object in all the instances given above. — Here are the Oxf. D. quotations: *Cursor Mundi* 7708: He him soght Wit all þe mightes þat he moght. *Ibid.* 18064: He þat suilkins mightes moght [suilkins = of such kind, suchlike]. Barbour's *Bruce* III, 366: God help him, that all mychtis may. Henry's *Wallace* III, 396: For all the power thai mocht.

**Praktiese Opleiding van Taalleraren.** Diegenen onder onze lezers en lezeressen die zich de "heroic age" herinneren, toen de voorloper van ons tijdschrift, *The Student's Monthly*, verscheen met zijn genoegelik mengelmoes van rijp en groen, zijn ongetwijfeld ook "Harriet's Diary" niet vergeten, de causerieën in proza en poezie van een der beminnelikste medewerksters. Wie de twee nu lichtelijk vergeelde jaargangen nog bezit, sla het nummer van November 1918 eens open, op bl. 179. "Harriet" vertelt van een ontmoeting met een vroegere studiegenote, sedert een jaar of twee werkzaam als lerares. De vriendin spreekt over haar ervaringen op school, maar haar relaas is voor de gespannen verwachting van de studente die over een jaar het beloofde land hoopt binnen te treden, een grote teleurstelling. "While you are studying, she told me, you don't think about it, but after I was appointed, I found out that, though I had worked hard for seven years, and got two certificates as a teacher, I had not the faintest idea how to instruct others. During my last four years at Amsterdam I don't think I missed one lecture, and yet I do not remember that one hour was given to, nay, not even a hint dropped about how you are to teach. And yet that is to be the work in life of by far the greater part of the students, and that is what, according to our certificates, we are qualified for. Of course there are many things you gradually learn by experience, but when you have studied so long you want to be somewhat prepared for your task.... I knew only very few schoolbooks, and not of one of them how to use it properly.... The greatest disappointment however I experienced during the literature lessons, to which I had looked forward with so much pleasure. I knew heaps of things but not the facts interesting for schoolchildren.... My favourite poems are too difficult for my pupils, and I sadly felt that to admire the grandness and beauty of a thing, does not give you the power to communicate this sensation to others."

We zullen al de bittere ervaringen van Jane niet weer ophalen. Als Harriet wat bekomen is van haar verbazing, vraagt ze haar vriendin of ze geen remedie weet om anderen zulke teleurstellingen te besparen. Jane noemt in de eerste en derde plaats kolleges over de theorie van opvoeding en onderwijs, en lezingen van ervaren leraren voor de English Club (!); in de tweede plaats: "Could not some experienced teachers give us a model lesson now and then, with explanations about his (her) method?"

Er is sedert de dagen van *The Student's Monthly* in de Nederlandse Anglistiek het een en ander veranderd. In 1918 verblijdden we ons op de komende "degree". We schrijven tans 1926; de "degree" is er, met de "akademiese opleiding", die zich voorlopig kenmerkt door een verlaging van het peil van de kennis der hedendaagse taal — het eerst nodige voor de a.s. leraar. Wordt dit verlies gekompenseerd door pogingen tot praktiese opleiding in Jane's geest? Het is ons tot dusver niet bekend.

Enige tijd geleden vernamen we dat B. en W. van 's Gravenhage officieel verlof hebben gegeven de leerlingen van de B-kursussen van de Vereniging "Moderne Talen" toe te laten tot het bijwonen van lessen op de middelbare scholen, voor zover de betrokken docenten het goed vinden. Wanneer Jane en Harriet dit lezen zullen ze zien dat er waarheid ligt opgesloten in het woord van de Prediker (laten we het maar in het Engels citeren): "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days." — Z.

## Reviews.

*The Death of Christopher Marlowe.* By J. LESLIE HOTSON, PH. D. London, The Nonesuch Press, 1925. 76 pp. 7/6.

For the first time then, after numerous attempts, of which a complete summary is given in the first part of the book, we are able to judge of the facts concerning Marlowe's death, while incidentally new particulars have been unearthed by Dr. Hotson regarding the poet's early life. We shall pass over the many blunders committed by previous biographers and merely state the results of the author's ingenious researches.

The following extract from the findings of the coroner's jury will suffice to give the reader an idea of the manner in which Marlowe was killed.

The poet and three companions: Ingram Frizer, Nicholas Skeres and Robert Poley had spent the whole of Wednesday, May 30, 1593 at the inn of a certain Eleanor Bull, widow, in Deptford Strand. In the evening a dispute arose about the score. In the course of this squabble Marlowe attacked Frizer from behind with a dagger which he had taken from him. The latter then, after recovering his weapon, inflicted a mortal wound over his antagonist's right eye, thereby causing his immediate death.

On June 1 the inquest was held and the same day the body was buried in St. Nicholas Church, Deptford. Frizer was imprisoned, but conditionally pardoned on June 28. Henceforth the old story of Marlowe dying in the London streets in a drunken brawl arising from a "lewd love" affair, may be relegated to the limbo of oblivion. Whether we have a truthful representation of the facts in the above statement, is another question, for, as Miss Eugénie de Kalb pointed out in *The Times* L.S., May 21, 1925, the report was founded on no other evidence but that of the three only witnesses, who may not have been disinterested enough to be reliable. And the suspicion of unreliability is certainly not weakened, if we know *who* Marlowe's companions were.

From Dr. Hotson's investigations it appears that Frizer was dependent on Mr. Thomas Walsingham of Chislehurst, whose son was the patron of Marlowe, as is evident from the publisher's dedication of *Hero and Leander* to this gentleman. Skeres was an associate of Frizer's in some shady financial transactions; he was involved in the Essex rebellion and the last we hear of him is as a prisoner in Bridewell. Poley turns out to be a spy for the Government, employed by Francis Walsingham in the Babington conspiracy of 1586. How did Marlowe come to be associated with this low crew? A most interesting inference may be drawn from another important document discovered by the author in the Privy Council Register, from which it appears that Marlowe had been absent from Cambridge for some months on *important State-affairs*, in which he had acquitted himself so meritoriously, that the Council found it necessary to praise him and to urge on the University Authorities the necessity of bestowing his degree on him, notwithstanding his absence and the ugly rumours busy tongues seem to have been spreading about him. There is no evidence of what nature Marlowe's good services to his Queen were, but it is not unlikely, that he too was a spy, which might throw some light on his connection with Poley and his friends. Though not detracting anything from the value of Dr. Hotson's discoveries, we hope to have made it clear that, even now, there

remain some questions to be solved, especially regarding Marlowe's mysterious absence from Cambridge and the reliability of the verdict.

Rotterdam.

W. A. OVAA.

*About Shakespeare and his Plays.* By G. F. BRADBY.  
London, Oxf. Univ. Press. 1926. 92 pp. 2/6.

The title of this unpretentious little volume is somewhat misleading, for though there are a number of quotations from the plays to support the author's opinions, there is very little about the plays themselves. But fairness bids us add immediately: these personal observations, though brief, are stimulating and worth considering and nowhere does one light upon cheap repetitions of others' verdicts. The chapter on Shakespeare's stage contains a few good remarks about the influence of the absence of curtain and scenery, and about Shakespeare's time-indication by means of his dialogues, with good illustrations. A few suggestive observations are offered about the poet's adherence to history or story, even if the character-drawing should suffer under this treatment. As an example Mr. Bradby adduces *The Merchant of Venice*, in which there is a clash between plot and character. "He gives us glimpses of a Shylock more real, more human, than the story will allow.... But the Shylock of the trial scene is the Shylock required by the plot; never quite convincing after we have been allowed to look below the surface of things." The chapter on Prose, Rhyme and Blank Verse presents no new points of view, neither is there anything remarkable in Comedy and Tragedy. In *The Man behind the Plays*, Mr. Bradby cautions against reading too much of Shakespeare into his plays (an attack on Frank Harris's *The Man Shakespeare*?). We are only justified in doing so, when a character speaks out of his part, e. g. when in *Twelfth Night* Duke Orsino pronounces his famous words about the man who marries a wife older than himself. "These are the sentiments not of an infatuated lover, but of a disillusioned husband." On page 60 the author writes: "*The Tempest* was written at Stratford-on-Avon" — a statement requiring some qualification. Mr. Dover Wilson, in his edition of *The Tempest* (conjointly with Prof. Quiller-Couch) expresses himself much more guardedly, in considering it as an abridgment of an older play, which "abridgment may have been carried through in his study at New Place".

A readable booklet, though more to be recommended to the general reader than to the professional student of Shakespeare and his plays.

W. A. OVAA.

*Daniël De Foe et ses Romans.* Par PAUL DOTTIN. Tome I: La vie et les aventures étranges et surprenantes de Daniël De Foe, Natif de Londres, Auteur de „Robinson Crusoë”; Tome II: Robinson Crusoë. Étude historique et critique; Tome III: Les romans secondaires de Daniël De Foe. Paris, London, 1924. iv+896 pp.

In 1924 there appeared no fewer than three good works on Defoe, a French, a German and an English-American one. The least extensive, as regards the subject matter dealt with, was Secord, *Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe*; it investigated what sources Defoe had used for his *Robinson Crusoe* and some later novels. Much more comprehensive was Ullrich, *Defoe's Robinson Crusoe*; it closely associated Defoe with his

principal work and gave a necessarily brief account of the development of the Robinsonades in world literature. The most voluminous was the work of Dottin mentioned above, and, to come to the point at once, it is an excellent book. The author has worked through and digested a respectable amount of literature. Besides this, he has found many new things in English archives, especially in the *Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports*, hitherto never used and containing nearly the whole correspondence between Defoe and the ministers (Harley and others), „pièces d'une réelle importance, non seulement pour la biographie du grand écrivain, mais aussi pour l'histoire de son époque.” Furthermore he has found many new data in numerous contemporary and later magazines, newspapers and pamphlets [e.g. (see p. 73) that Defoe was controller of the state lottery], and lastly acquainted himself by personal inspection with Defoe's surroundings. He writes a straightforward narrative, in a good, even style, candid and generally sober. There are many striking passages and descriptions; we only point to the portrayal of young Daniel (p. 22-23), to the proceedings against Defoe after the appearance of his *Trueborn Englishman* (end of ch. vi in the first volume), the concluding summary of volume I, the comparison between Defoe and Bunyan (p. 325-327), the valuation of Robinson Crusoe as the first modern novel (p. 456-475), and many more. Many a terse, picturesque expression stamps itself upon our memory. The third part, the *Serious Reflections*, was unsuccessful: „cette fois Robinson était bien mort: la philosophie l'avait tué.” (p. 359). Or, to denote the inferiority of the imitations: „les enfants de Robinson sont des bâtards ou des dégénérés.” (p. 387). *Robinson Crusoe* has survived all imitations: „ainsi après deux siècles de vie, Robinson trône seul en son pays; père dénaturé, il a réussi à dévorer un à un tous ses descendants” (p. 394). He characterizes wittily the sentimentality of the imitations in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century: „ces vieux sauvages sortis des pages de De Foe, toujours aussi laids, mais très adoucis par l'âge” (p. 422); and the difference between Defoe's realism and the romanticism of Rousseau, who recommended Robinson Crusoe for Emile as a standard work: „si Rousseau avait bien connu Robinson, il l'aurait pris en horreur” (p. 461). None but a witty man, who is master of his subject, can write like this.

As appendices the author gives: 1. a list of Defoe's works. As Defoe nearly always wrote anonymously the drawing up of this list is difficult and sometimes arbitrary. Chalmers in 1786 ascribed 174 works to Defoe, Wilson in 1830 210, Hazlitt in 1840 183 “certain” and 52 “doubtful”; Lee in 1869 came to 254, Trent in 1912 to 370 titles. According to Dottin 340 are certainly Defoe's, whereas there are 60 which he ascribes to him on purely internal grounds, without venturing to pronounce a decisive opinion. As among these works is also the *Review*, which he wrote practically alone during nine years three times a week, this list convincingly proves Defoe's extraordinary energy. — In a second appendix Dottin gives a critical bibliography. In future any one who wishes to study Defoe and his work has an indispensable guide in the two appendices.

The first volume deals with Defoe's life and also uses his works to explain his life, just as in the other two volumes the life often serves to elucidate the works. A hazardous method, demanding subtle feeling and intuition, but if both are present, as in Dottin's case, capable of rendering good services. By means of it Dottin succeeds in accounting for a good deal that is remarkable in Defoe's eventful life. As Defoe was a public character, his biography at the same time gives many a remarkable picture of the times. The second volume gives a thorough discussion of the genesis,

the influence and the significance of *Robinson Crusoe*, also of the *Further Adventures* and the *Serious Reflections*, together with a rather cursory survey of its vogue in other countries. The third volume investigates in the same way the later novels: *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, *The Journal of the Plague-Year*, *Singleton*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jack*, *Roxana* and the *New Voyage round the World*.

Dottin rightly places *Robinson Crusoe* very high and again we are struck by the way in which a genius has unconsciously created a masterpiece, the literary and social significance of which cannot be easily overrated. Less favourable is Dottin's judgment, however objectively expressed, of Defoe's character. He considers him a person who had good principles in his youth, but who was led by his passions and by the force of circumstance to cast them all successively overboard. Business-man as he was, Defoe saw everything from the point of view of profit and practical utility; his desire for money and position and his speculations made him a hack writer and a government spy. Not every one will agree with this view. It may be said in Defoe's defence that he assumed the rôle of a spy in the public interest and that his age had different ideas about what is good and evil in public life than ours. Still, this fact cannot exonerate him: even his own age, if the facts had been known, would have blamed him for writing secretly against the government while being in its pay as a writer in its support (p. 204). He was discharged from prison on a promise of publishing nothing; immediately he broke his promise, protected by anonymity (p. 127). He even wrote pamphlets pro and con in an ecclesiastical controversy, to make money (p. 233). Despicable, too, is his letter to Nottingham, "une lettre abjecte" as Dottin rightly says (p. 107). Space prevents us from entering into the matter at length; there is much to be said about it, but Dottin has given weighty reasons for his view. Yet our judgment is mitigated if we consider that Defoe in his voluminous work has given us more of himself than most others; it is with him as with the heroes in his novels: "en eux le bien et le mal se mélagent, les qualités et les défauts les plus contradictoires se trouvent réunis" (p. 798). We see all his weak points; knowing too much about him we cannot idealize him. We should only be inclined to ask: is Dottin's French mind able to understand and appreciate Puritanism? He views it with a modern critical eye, and before modern intellectual criticism no religious system can hold its own (see e.g. p. 466-471). But this criticism was not born until a quarter of a century after Defoe; his contemporaries and he himself were unconscious of any conflict between their religion and their lives, or if they did feel any incongruity, they said in good faith with the apostolic words: "In many things we offend all; for the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." The question is not whether Puritanism comes into conflict with life, but whether the good Puritan did not strive more earnestly and more honestly than others to saturate his life with his faith.

Here I have unconsciously come to a critical remark on Dottin's work. A few more additions and observations may be suggested. *Robinson Crusoe* is a continuation of the picaresque novels, with the reservation that the picaro is here a person of middle class origin. Owing to this the picaro has been brought up in good principles, soon feels a conflict between those principles and his actions, then comes to self-examination (to which the desert island motif, not indeed new in itself, but here for the first time expressly introduced, strongly contributes), and thus to psychological analysis. It is one of the most important aspects of Defoe's work that, unconsciously,

and aiming at nothing beyond the writing of a novel of adventure, he released the prose narrative from the narrow limits within which the adventurer-hero had kept it thus far, and in this manner paved the way for the modern novel. All this Dottin either does not indicate at all or only in passing, though it is of great importance.

Dottin of course knows Ullrich's bibliography *Robinson und Robinsonaden* (1898), the indispensable work for anyone wishing to become acquainted with the Robinson literature. He does not know, however, that Ullrich has given a great many additions in the *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde* xi (1907/08) p. 444-456, 489-498, 23 pages in two columns of close print. These additions, which are not yet complete either, prove once more the enormous vogue of *Robinson*. — Another small gap in Dottin's Bibliography may be noted here. Max Günther wrote an *Entstehungsgeschichte von Defoe's Robinson Crusoe* (1909). In 1914 appeared Brüggemann, *Utopie und Robinsonade. Untersuchungen zu Schnabels Insel Felsenburg. Krinke Kesmes* by Smeeks as a possible source of Defoe has been discussed by Hoogewerff, L'Honoré Naber and Polak, as Hubbard has mentioned<sup>1)</sup>. Some articles by Ullrich, among them *Einführung in das Studium Daniel Defoe's* (Zeitschr. f. franz. u. engl. Unterricht, Bd. 19) are not without significance.

From Defoe's own words in the *Review* and other writings Dottin gathers a good deal of material for his life history. Once or twice we feel inclined to wonder if he does not attach too much value to those utterances [see e.g. Defoe's activities in Scotland in 1706; see also (p. 34, 37) the opinion that Defoe must have travelled in Italy; Ullrich (*Defoe's R. C.* p. 3) does not mention this country]; especially as he himself admits (p. 147 note): „il faut toujours contrôler les dires de De Foe avant de les admettre.” This unreliability will probably make unanimity in the judgment of Defoe for ever impossible.

On p. 437 Dottin entitles a chapter: „*Robinson Crusoe*” en Allemagne and in it deals also with the Dutch Robinsonades. The author will allow us to object to this. The Netherlands are, and have been for many centuries, politically and culturally, an independent country, where the Robinsonade had a development of its own. Besides, owing to the freedom of the printing press, many French translations appeared there.

There are a few unfortunate misprints. The attack of the Whigs on Defoe (p. 212) did not begin in 1718, but in 1713. Raleigh, a contemporary of Queen Elisabeth, did not travel 1695-1696 (p. 305). The Hebrew translation (p. 373) was of 1883, Montreille's adaptation (p. 406) of 1768; Lesage's imitation (p. 413) of 1732 (cf. Ullrich). The Dutch translation was the second time printed in 1735 and 1736, instead of 1725 and 1726 (p. 451). Chalmers' work (p. 801) appeared not in 1876 but in 1786. Vanscouten (p. 753) is probably our countryman Schouten.<sup>2)</sup>

On p. 739 the author thinks that Defoe confuses Crassus and Croesus (“are you not as rich as Crassus?”) and that Swift, his enemy, would have enjoyed this blunder. Crassus, however, was the richest man of his time, was for that reason taken into Caesar's triumvirate and became proverbial in the expression: “Crasso divitior.”

Once or twice Secord can supplement Dottin, e.g. that Pitmans Relations,

<sup>1)</sup> Dr. Staverman must allow us to add that he himself was the first to call attention to it, in his thesis: *Robinson Crusoe in Nederland* (Groningen, 1907). — Ed.

<sup>2)</sup> Ullrich in a review in Hoops' *Englische Studien*, LX, p. 364-370 also points out: Darlymple, instead of Darlymple, Etton instead of Elton (p. 236, resp. 7, 8, and register) and asks if the English translation of *Simplicissimus* really belongs to the year 1688.

Lecomte, Ides and Dampier were indeed sources of Defoe (cf. Dottin p. 339-341, Secord p. 31, 107). Secord says that Lecomte speaks unfavourably about China, as does Defoe, following his example; according to Dottin Lecomte expresses himself favourably and Defoe's unfavourable judgment must be explained from his fondness for paradoxical contradiction. Inversely, Dottin mentions the *Hist. naturelle des îles Antilles* (p. 299), Raleigh (p. 304) and Nieuhoff (p. 340) as sources which Secord does not recognize. That Selkirk had little influence on the creation of *Robinson Crusoe* and that the *Memoirs of Carlton* were really written by Defoe, is the opinion of both Secord and Dottin; Ullrich too (*Defoes R. C.* p. 72 foll.) denies influence of Selkirk almost completely.

It is not my intention by the above to detract in the least from the merits of Dottin's work. Let me therefore end as I began: it is an excellent book. Anyone occupying himself in future with Defoe and *Robinson Crusoe* may start from this work with its clear and objective point of view, its thorough research and its full bibliography. It is a milestone. For the present, research into Defoe's life and into *Robinson* may be allowed to rest. The first great work that must be done is that which we should have liked to see Ullrich achieve, which the latter in his *Defoes Robinson Crusoe* and Dottin in his second volume have done cursorily: an enquiry into the significance of *Robinson Crusoe* and the development of the *Robinsonade* in the 18th and 19th centuries. May we hope that Dottin will take this task upon him?

Deventer.

Dr. W. H. STAVERMAN.

*Walt Whitman.* By JOHN BAILEY. (English Men of Letters, New Series.) Macmillan, 1926. 5/-.

With Mr. Bailey's appraisements of Whitman the artist there will be few to find fault, few, that is, who have really read through the rugged American poet's exceedingly unequal work — and who have found that the 'Leaves of Grass', so far from being always lush and green and grassy, are often, indeed more often than not, the merest wood-shavings and sawdust. The line of least resistance which Whitman the poet consistently followed proved his undoing as an artist. 'Most of Whitman's long poems lose themselves in words. The immense *Song of Myself*, in some ways his central poem, could not perhaps have displayed as it does the exuberance of his interest in all the works and ways of all sorts of men if it had been much shorter. And that capacity for noticing and enjoying everything was one of his chief poetic gifts. But the poem pays a heavy price for displaying it. As a work of art it would have gained immeasurably by the omission of thirty or forty of its fifty pages.' (p. 99; my italics). 'It is noticeable that the nearer Whitman approaches to regular metre the less, on the whole, his work suffers from his natural verbosity.' (p. 100). On the other hand the competent handling of regular metre and rime was beyond him. 'He never tried to learn how to use them and never used them with success.' (p. 115). Where is he successful at all? He deliberately sacrificed the great privilege of verse: the sense of expectations roused and fulfilled. And yet he produces, in his happiest moments, a quite satisfactory rhythm, which as a rule is based on a few tentative lines that recur either bodily or in some modified shape. 'If [Whitman's free verse] scarcely looks forward it never, in the more successful poems, fails to look backward.' (p. 116). But his 'unit' is the statement as such, and this makes for monotony. The parallel which Mr. Bailey

draws between Ralph Hodgson's *Song of Honour* and Whitman's *Salut au Monde* is very instructive. Such an object lesson is enough to prove that 'strict' verse is a far more flexible instrument than 'free', in spite of the fact that Hodgson has made scant use of his opportunities.

Though Mr. Bailey's business is first of all with Whitman the poet, he has had also to deal with Whitman the man. This biographical part of the book has not, apparently, been a labour of love to the author, who may have been well-advised in ignoring the extravagant claims made for Whitman by certain admirers, but who, at the same time, is content to repeat, on the authority of these same unhinged admirers, statements which are exceedingly unlikely to have had any warrant in fact. What are we to think of Whitman's romantic adventure in aristocratic New Orleans (where in the year of grace 1848, he formed an intimate relationship with some woman of higher social rank than his own) and his reputed fatherhood? The present reviewer's attitude is that of Dr. Johnson after Macpherson published *Ossian*. Part mystic, part mystifier, Whitman must have presented some traits of character that recall Browning's *Mr. Sludge, the Medium*. In his poems he was quite justified in giving experiences of the imagination for real ones. But a man with two feeble-minded brothers has not the right to describe himself as being of perfect stock.

A chapter dealing with Walt Whitman's influence abroad would have been welcome. This influence — negligible, it would seem, in France<sup>1)</sup> — has been considerable in Germany. (Schlaf, Arno Holz.) In Germany, too, he has become the centre of a religious cult. And Germany saw the publication of *Der Yankee-Heiland* by Ed. Bertz (Dresden, 1906), a well-written, well-documented book, which disposes of many legends concerning Whitman and shows the utter derivativeness of his thought. The artist Whitman remains, and his qualities and defects as such have never been discussed in a more illuminating way than in this book by Mr. Bailey.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

---

*Herman Melville*. By JOHN FREEMAN. (English Men of Letters, New Series.) Macmillan, 1926. 5/—.

Which is the greater genius in American literature, Whitman or Melville? After reading Freeman's study every lover and admirer of that glorious nondescript book called *Moby-Dick* will fling his cap without any misgivings or qualms, for Melville, the narrator, navigator, myth-maker, and heroic creator of heroes; ponderer, like Milton, on life and death, on free will, fore-knowledge and fate; glimpser of hidden truths like Blake, but as sombre-eyed as Blake was serene.

The fashioning of small perfect things was beyond him. He could be as romantically extravagant as any wild romanticist, and as he grew older his habit of walking Psyche his Soul up and down endless *alleys Titanic of cypress* became more and more pronounced. But he did not deal in anything vicarious, and even his most extravagant structures are raised on firm foundations of personal, first-hand, experience....

---

<sup>1)</sup> In Gustave Lanson's well-known *Histoire illustrée de la littérature française* (Hachette, 1923) Whitman is never mentioned. But is not Emile Verhaeren somewhat indebted to him?

O to sail to sea in a ship!  
 To leave this steady unendurable land,  
 To leave the tiresome sameness of the streets, the side-walks and the houses,  
 To leave you O solid motionless land, and entering a ship,  
 To sail and sail and sail!

O to have life henceforth a poem of new joys!  
 To dance, clap hands, exult, shout, skip, leap, roll on, float on!  
 To be a sailor of the world bound for all ports,  
 A ship itself, (see indeed these sails I spread to the sun and air,)  
 A swift and swelling ship full of rich words, full of joys.

These are the words of Walt Whitman, who specialized, of set purpose, in things vicarious. These are the *deeds* of Herman Melville. But when the sea had given him what he wanted he turned his back upon her and settled down in a quiet corner to write. A descendant not only of Melvilles but of Gansevoorts, he should have been a man of independent means, able to fling his books into the faces of a Philistine public. But he wanted to make a living by his pen and in order to do so he changed his manner more than once. And failed. As he bitterly complained to his friend Hawthorne: "What I feel most moved to write, that is banned — it will not pay. Yet, altogether, write the *other* way I cannot. So the product is a final hash, and all my books are botches." He withdrew from the world and its contests, he gave up striving for a niche in the house of Fame; for a few years he lectured in the States, trying to turn an honest quarter-dollar, but again disappointing his audiences, who saw in him a kind of Louis de Rougemont, but who, instead of being regaled with cannibals, were treated to disquisitions on statuary. At last he was given the post of Inspector of Customs, which he retained for nineteen years. When he died in 1891 he was a forgotten figure, no one recalling the fact (as John Freeman says on page 186) that *Moby-Dick* came between *Pendennis* and *Esmond*, and between *David Copperfield* and *Bleak House*....

Our days are seeing Melville coming into his own at last<sup>1)</sup> and I venture to recommend his books not only to the general reader, but also to such students as would be glad to tackle a fine, big and unhackneyed subject for special study. The fact that John Freeman's excellent 'first guide' is number one of the 'new series' of '*English Men of Letters*' (General Editor Mr. J. C. Squire) should prevent narrow-minded examiners from demurring on the specious plea that an American ought to be excluded from a candidate's purview.

In conclusion, and merely to prove the attention I have given to the book reviewed, I wish to point out an inaccuracy on page 123, where John Freeman, in quoting some passages from the final catastrophe of *Moby-Dick*, writes *harpooner*, the British word, instead of *harpooneer*, the term which Melville uses throughout.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

*A Dictionary of Modern English Usage.* By H. W. FOWLER.  
 Pp. 742. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1926. 7/6.

The name Fowler is well-known to all students of English. The two brothers have deserved the gratitude of them all by the painstaking care

<sup>1)</sup> Though in a recent German anthology of *Amerikanische Prosa vom Bürgerkrieg bis auf die Gegenwart* (1863-1922) von Dr. WALTHER FISCHER (Teubner, 1926), which gives extracts from the work of thirty American authors, Melville is not even mentioned. — Ed.

and the scholarly efficiency with which they composed the Concise Oxford Dictionary and the Pocket Oxford Dictionary. Both dictionaries bear testimony to the capability of the writers through their exactness of definition, their lucidity and their general up-to-dateness and are unrivalled by any dictionary of the same size.

In "The King's English" the authors aim at a wider scope: as its title indicates, this book purports to be a guide to the writing of "the King's", i. e. correct standard English. It treats of Vocabulary, Syntax, Punctuation, Grammar and various other matters, fitly to be classified as matters of Style. By collecting — and suggesting corrections for — a large number of greater or smaller blunders, culled from good as well as bad writers and from newspapers, the writers wish to raise the level of the language to a higher standard.

A *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* was planned by the combined energies of the two brothers. The actual writing of it, however, was done by the elder (H. W. Fowler), the younger having died in 1918. The subjects treated in it are more varied than in "The King's English", though many of the telling headings of the articles of the one book turn up again in the other. All the most important aspects of "Modern English Usage" are dealt with: pronunciation, spelling, punctuation, the correct meanings of words, distinctions between synonyms, idiomatic phrases, suffixes and prefixes, style, syntax. Wherever a writer — and the author has in mind in the first place the native writer — can and often does go wrong, a warning finger is raised and the right direction pointed out.

Of course, it is very difficult to decide what constitutes modern English usage. In purely lexicographical articles the right principle has been applied. On p. 4. the writer treats of *adjectives in -ble of exceptional form or sense* and finds that there are many words that do not conform to the normal type of these words. Then he goes on to say that "it is better to go on broader lines", . . . that "the words and usages to which exception is taken should be tested not by the original Latin practice, nor by the subsequent French practice, nor by the English practice of any particular past period, even if any of these were as precise as is sometimes supposed, but by what inquiry may reveal as the now current conception of how words in *-ble* are to be formed and what they may mean". This, of course, is the only test in deciding between the right or wrong usage in questions of language.

It is curious to note, however, that the writer often ignores this principle when he discusses questions of syntax. An extreme case, illustrating this, is found on p. 524, in the article on the Sequence of Tenses. Amongst other things the writer says that we say: Could you tell me what the time *is*, instead of: What the time *was*, and adds: "which (i. e. the latter) nevertheless is strictly correct". This is a sort of grammar-writing which one would hardly expect. In other cases the writer is mildly tolerant of what is illogical but in common use; yet he is hopefully optimistic, for he says that "it will pass away in time, for *magna est veritas et praevalebit*". He adds, however, that "in the meantime it is worth anyone's while to get on speaking terms with the new exactitudes". (p. 382: All is not gold that glisters.) On another occasion, in the article on 's *incongruous*, Mr. F. regrets that the genitive case with names of things is gaining ground compared with the of-construction. He attributes this to the striving after brevity in the headline of the modern newspaper. In his typically fresh and vivid style he says: "even ONTARIO'S PRIME MINISTER we can bow down before while he is in capitals; but when he comes amongst us in the ordinary garb of lower-case

type, we pluck up heart again and want to kick him". When he wrote this he must have forgotten that on pp. 5 and 6 of his own book he had written in lower-case type: *the termination's capabilities*, and: *the sentence's structure*. This shows how useless it is to prescribe rules of grammar as if they were unalterable laws and to run counter to tendencies that may be at work in a language: the lawgiver will break his own laws while giving them.

It is very refreshing what the dictionary says on various points of style, such as: genteelism, novelese, novelty-hunting, and many others. One would wish the book to be constantly on the desk — or rather in the hands — of that host of English writers who daily supply the eager demand for "news" and "light literature". In all these articles one admires the healthy commonsense of the writer's corrections and suggestions. Occasionally, however, one wonders if he does not go too far in his predilection for the simple and the natural in language. To give one instance, a foreigner might be landed in an awkward predicament, if he followed Mr. F.'s suggestions in the article on genteelism and inserted words as: sweat, spit, bitch or belly into his conversation with the people he generally meets. Would not it be better for him to be genteel with the genteel and avoid the offensive words?

However, these remarks do not detract from the merits of the book as a whole. At most they are the harmless fads the writer deplores in his dedicatory letter to his brother. They are forgotten when we see the abundance of instructive articles on such a variety of subjects as the book contains, which, moreover, are put in such a delightfully fresh and original style. This style alone makes one pick up the book for the mere pleasure of enjoying its language.

For all these reasons there can be no doubt but the *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* will prove a worthy companion to the C.O.D. and the P.O.D. and will find its way into the hands of all who take the study of English seriously.

The Hague.

H. J. VAN DER MEER.

---

*Wenken over het Samenstellen van Wetenschappelijke Geschriften*  
door Dr. G. VAN RIJNBERK, Hoogleeraar aan de Universiteit van  
Amsterdam. 39 pp. Amsterdam, Swets & Zeitlinger, 1926. Prijs f 0,90.

Prof. van Rijnberk, redakteur van het *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*, heeft nuttig werk gedaan door in de vorm van een brochure een aantal wenken te publiceren over de samenstelling van wetenschappelijke geschriften. Hoewel hij daarbij in de eerste plaats mediese verhandelingen op het oog heeft gehad, bevatten zijn opmerkingen zoveel wat ook voor anderen dan medici van belang is, dat wij niet aarzelen ze aan te bevelen aan allen die, b.v. bij het schrijven van een dissertatie, zich rekenschap hebben te geven van de techniese en stilistiese eisen van hun werk.

Veel van wat Prof. van Rijnberk zegt over de tekortkomingen van wetenschappelijke auteurs, en over de middelen om hierin verbetering te brengen, kunnen wij onderschrijven, al is er natuurlik enig verschil tussen de toestanden op medies en op filologies gebied. Wij zullen hier geen uittreksel geven uit zijn vaak pittige en rake opmerkingen over "de moreel-wetenschappelijke rechtvaardiging van een geschrift"; de indeling, inleiding,

„vraagstelling”, methodiek, het „soortelijk gewicht” van wetenschappelijke geschriften, en zoveel meer; doch waar wij de brochure in het algemeen aanbevelen, willen wij toch niet nalaten de aandacht te vestigen op wat ons er minder juist of minder volledig in voorkomt. De omstandigheid dat wij zelf in een glazen huisje wonen, maant hierbij natuurlik tot voorzichtigheid. Men zal het echter wel met ons eens zijn dat een geschrift dat aanwijzingen bevat voor de stilstiese en techniese verzorging van voor de druk bestemde stukken, zelf aan redelijke eisen in dit opzicht moet voldoen. De auteur zegt in zijn inleiding: „De eigenlijke taalzuivering zal ik geheel ter zijde laten”, doch dit onthief hem niet van de plicht zijn eigen taal zuiver te houden. Wie te velde trekt tegen „het misbruik van vreemde woorden en uitheemsche uitdrukkingen en zinswendingen”, voege de daad bij het woord, en vermijde Latijnse en andere versierselen van zijn tekst, waarbij hij gevaar loopt onjuist te citeren, als in: *medio tutissime ibis* (bl. 7), of een uitdrukking verkeerd te gebruiken, als op bl. 22, waar de schrijver uitroeft: „alsof de instinctieve intuïtie en de phantasie niet de laatste oorzaak, de *dea ex machina* van elk (*sic*) waarlijk groote en belangrijke ontdekking is!” Immers, wie zo doet, hoort licht de verwijtende waarschuwing: *medice, cura te ipsum.*

Ook in ander opzicht gaat de auteur niet vrij uit. Wie angstvallig volgens De Vries en Te Winkel schrijft: „Ziedaar slechts enkele van de tekortkomingen, welke *den pennevruchten* der Nederlandsche artsen schijnen aan te kleven” (bl. 5), moet zich hoeden voor „de kern van *den weerzin*, die vele wetenschappelijke workers gevoelen tegen literaire verzorging van hun stukken” (bl. 22), en niet over het hoofd zien: „Elk onderdeel der wetenschap toch heeft *haar* eigen eischen” (bl. 14). Elders heeft hij het op een en dezelfde pagina over „de bladzij”, „de bladzijde”, en „het bladzij”. Zo noteerden we nog enkele slordigheden en — we zeggen het met schroom — een vrij groot aantal drukfouten (bl. 8, 9, 19, 21, 29, 31, 32 [vier], 33, 37, 38); negen hiervan in het gedeelte dat handelt over kopie en drukproef!

Wij zouden verder willen vragen of de schrijver zijn taak niet iets ruimer had kunnen opvatten. Zouden b.v. zijn eigen collega's hem niet dankbaar zijn geweest voor enige wenken betreffende de usances van buitenlandse redacties en drukkerijen, waar zoveel Nederlandse geleerden medewerken o.a. aan Amerikaanse tijdschriften? — In het algemene gedeelte worden twee Engelse boeken genoemd, die wenken voor de samenstelling van geneeskundige geschriften bevatten; in het techniese gedeelte, over kopie en drukproef, ontbreekt echter iedere literatuuropgave. Toch had hier voor het Nederlands vermeld mogen worden het boekje van J. W. Enschedé, *Nederlandsche Drukregels voor Proeflezers en Correctoren* ('s Gravenhage, 1921, f 2.50), terwijl ieder die in het Engels publiceert, in tal van opzichten zijn voordeel kan doen met de *Authors' & Printers' Dictionary* (A guide for Authors, Editors, Printers, Correctors of the Press, Compositors and Typists) van F. Howard Collins (Milford, 3/6) en de *Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press, Oxford*, van Horace Hart (Id., 2/—). — Bij de opmerkingen over de drukproef missen wij een wenk over het aanbrengen van ingrijpende veranderingen in de tekst, waartegen R. W. Chapman in zijn inleiding tot de *Authors' and Printers' Dictionary* zo nadrukkelijk waarschuwt.

Wij zouden nog op enkele andere punten kunnen wijzen, doch willen met deze opmerkingen volstaan. De schrijver moge er het bewijs in zien dat wij zijn brochure met belangstelling gelezen hebben. Wij wensen Prof. van Rijnberk's Wenken spoedig een herziene, vermeerderde herdruk toe. — Z.

### Brief Mention.

*Die sozial-politischen Anschauungen Coleridges und sein Einfluss auf Carlyle*, von NIKOLAUS SCHANCK. Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie. Heft XVI. Bonn, Verlag von Peter Hanstein, 1924.

In this little book (89 pages) the political and social views of Coleridge and Carlyle (or Col. and Carl., as the two authors are familiarly referred to from the first line!) are compared down to minute details. It is the author's opinion that Coleridge as thinker has never yet received his full due. He emphasizes the fact that Carlyle, after visiting Coleridge at Highgate, unlike others who saw him there, was of opinion that Coleridge's thinking powers were still great and unimpaired. It was Coleridge who unclosed to Carlyle the mysteries of Kant's philosophy. The author treats Carlyle's works one by one and shows with numerous quotations that Coleridge's influence on him has been much greater than is generally thought. It is interesting to see how even the mode of expression is often Coleridge's.

In the first part, 'Die materialistisch-egoistische Weltanschauung der liberalen Epoche', the author gives a clear exposition of the views against which Coleridge and Carlyle reacted.

The little book is worth reading because it shows Coleridge to be greater and Carlyle to be smaller than they are generally supposed to be. But the second part is little more than a string of quotations. The whole is too much the work of the industrious plodder, too little of the student who delights in seeking and who *must* send his find, however small, into the world. — A. C. E. V.-V.

## Bibliography.

### PERIODICALS.

**De Gids.** XC, 6. June 1926. Includes: A. W. C. Zuidema, Oldenbarneveldt als treurspelheld (400—420). — P. Geyl, Moderne Historische Apologetiek in Engeland (421—438; continued July number, 44—63).

**Neophilologus.** XI, 3. April 1926. Includes: L. P. H. Eykman, The soft palate and nasality (207—218) — **Id.** XI, 4. July 1926. W. Heldt, *The Queen's Wake*. (264—277) — L. P. H. Eykman, The soft palate and nasality (277—278). — **Id.** XIII, 1. Oct. 1926. W. van der Gaaf, A friend of mine. (18—31). — Fr. A. Pompen, Defoe en zijn Bronnen. (31—34). — A. G. van Hamel, Koning Arthur's Vader. (34—41).

**De Drie Talen.** 42, 5—7. May—July 1926. R. Volbeda, De konstrukties met to read en to write. (65—70; 81—84; 97—100).

**De Nieuwe Taalgids.** XX, 4. Includes N. A. Donkersloot, De invloed van Keats en Shelley in Nederland gedurende de negentiende eeuw (190—196. Discusses Dr. G. Dekker's dissertation on the subject). — **Id.** XX, 5. Includes: W. van der Ent, Bredero en de tooneelspelers (255—258).

**The Review of English Studies.** II, 6. April 1926. W. W. Greg, Some notes on Ben Jonson's works. — G. C. Moore Smith, Randolph's *Epithalamium to George Goring*. — H. Jenkinson, Notes on the study of English punctuation of the sixteenth century. — J. G. Scott, The names of the heroines of Elizabethan sonnet-sequences. — G. Ambrose, George Gascoigne. — B. M. Ward, The death of Gascoigne. — W. W. Greg, Editors at work and play. — H. Child, Revivals of English dramatic works, 1919—1925. — J. Platt, The development of English colloquial idiom during the 18th cent., II. — Notes and Observations. — Correspondence. — Reviews, incl. one by J. H. G. Grattan of Kruisinga, *A Handbook of Present-day English*. — **Id.** II, 7. July 1926. O. Doughty, The English malady of the eighteenth century. — S. R. Golding, The authorship of *The Maid's Metamorphosis*. — W. S. Clark, The published but unacted "Heroic Plays" of Roger Boyle, E. of Orrery. — A. S. Collins, The growth of the reading public during the eighteenth century. I. — Sir M. Hunter, Act- and scene-division in the plays of Shakespeare. — G. H. Cowling, A note on Chaucer's stanza. — F. S. Boas, Sir Sidney Lee. — **Id.** II, 8. Oct. 1926. A. H. Nethercot, Abraham Cowley's *Discourse concerning Style*. — G. H. Cowling, Chaucer's *Complaintes of Mars and of Venus*. — A. W. Reed, Sixt Birck and Henry Medwall, *de Vera Nobilitate*. — C. S. Emden, Lines of Elizabethan song composers: some new facts. — J. G. Scott, Minor Elizabethan sonneteers and their greater predecessors. — A. S. Collins, The growth of the reading public during the eighteenth century. II. — J. A. Fort, Thorpe's text of Shakespeare's Sonnets. — L. F. Powell, Hau Kiou Choaan.

**The Modern Language Review.** XXI, 2. April 1926. Includes: T. P. Harrison,

Bartholomew Yong, translator. — G. Hjort, The good and bad quartos of 'Romeo and Juliet' and 'Love's Labour's Lost.' — V. M. Jeffery, Italian influence in Fletcher's 'Faithful Shepherdess.' — **Id.** XXI, 3. July 1926. Carleton Brown, The Maidstone text of the 'Proverbs of Alfred.' — M. A. Bald, James Melvill: an obscured man of letters. — T. H. Banks, Sir John Denhams 'Cooper's Hill'. — A. Bell, Gaimar and the Edgar-Ælfþryð story. — **Id.** XXI, 4. Oct. 1926. R. E. Zachrison, Some Yorkshire Place-Names. York, Ure, Jervaulx. — J. Hutton, A poem by Sir John Beaumont, wrongly attributed to Drummond of Hawthornden. — M. H. Dodds, A second visit to Gondaland. — J. Crossland, The conception of 'mesure' in some medieval poets. — J. L. Weston, The relative position of the 'Percival' and 'Galahad' romances. — E. Allison Peers, The influence of Young and Gray in Spain. — D. Yates, Grillparzer's Hero and Shakespeare's Juliet.

**Anglia.** XLIX = N. F. XXXVII, 1926, 4. Allison Gaw, John Sincklo as one of Shakespeare's actors. — F. C. Steinermayr, Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt- und Kunstanschauung III. — Kurt Nagel, Wie ein volkslied wird. ("Sally in our Alley" the model of Bojes "Lore am Tore"). — Alfred Heinrich, Charles Dickens und die "Faust Outlines". — V. Langhans, Zu John Kochs Artikel in Anglia 37, 193. (Concerning Chaucer). — Fr. Klaeber, Zur jüngeren Genesis. — Otto B. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortforschung. — Note, concerning a Bibliography of Hamlet. — J. Koch, Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Kochs Abhandlung „Der gegenwärtige Stand der Chaucerforschung“, Bd 37 N. F., 193 ff. — **Id.** L = N. F. XXXVIII, 1926, 1. E. v. Schaubert, Zur geschichte der Black-Letter Broadside Ballad. — J. Koch, Nochmals zur Frage des Prologs in Chaucers "Legend of good Women". — Viktor Langhans, Hugo Lange und die Lösung der Legenden-prologfrage bei Chaucer. — J. Koch, Nachtrag zu meinem letzten Aufsatz über Chaucers Legenden-prolog (Anglia N. F. 37, 17 ff.). — Eugen Einenkel, Bemerkung zu dem Streite über Chaucers Legendenprolog. — **Id.** L = N. F. XXXVIII, 1926, 2. Fr. Klaeber, Beowulfiana. — Helene Richter, Walter Savage Landor (1775–1864). — F. C. Steinermayr, Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt- und Kunstanschauung IV. — M. J. Minckwitz, Zu den "Casa Guidi Windows" der Dichterin E. Barrett-Browning. — **Id.** L = N. F. XXXVIII, 1926, 3. Fr. Klaeber, Beowulfiana (continued). — F. C. Steinermayr, Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt- und Kunstanschauung. (end). — P. Fijn van Draat, Maternal Impression. — Eugen Einenkel, Friedrich Kluge †.

**Englische Studien.** LX, 1926, 2/3. Includes O. L. Jiriczek, Der Lautwert des runischen r zur Wikingerzeit. — J. W. Draper, Chaucer's Wardrobe (an interesting article on domestic arrangements in medieval times). — Erna Fischer, Ein nordenglisches moralisch-religiöses Versfragment aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. — C. C. Barnard, Wordsworth and the Ancient Mariner. — P. L. Jaeger, On English war-slang. — O. Jespersen, Die grammatischen Rangstufen (self-defence against the criticism by Funke in the preceding part of this volume). — Reviews, including an appreciative notice by E. Eckhardt of Miss Frijlinck's dissertation.

**Beiblatt zur Anglia.** 37, 4 and 5 (April & May 1926) contain a number of reviews, chiefly on the history of English literature, by Liljegren, Fischer, and Jiriczek. **Id.** 37, 6–8 (June–August). Reviews, among which we specially mention Luick on Jordan, Handbuch der mittenglischen Grammatik. Notes, including Ekwall, The name Salcey; Liljegren in answer to his reviewer in the English Historical Review; and Klaeber, Randglossen zu Texterklärungen. — **Id.** 37, 9–11 (Sept.–Nov. 1926). Reviews, incl. Einenkel on Root's edition of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*; Fehr on Spurgeon, Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion; Keynes, the Writings of William Blake, and Amy Lowell, John Keats.

**Herrig's Archiv.** 149, 3/4 (March 1926). Includes Hans Marcus, Goldsmith über Deutschland II. — Ph. Aronstein, Ein dramatischer Kunsthanderwerker der englischen Renaissance (A. Munday) I. — A.-B. Modersohn, Cicero in englischen Geistesleben den 16ten Jahrh. II. — Notes and reviews. — **Id.** 150, 1/2. (June 1926). Includes A. Brandl, Felix Liebermann †. — Ph. Aronstein, Ein dramatischer Kunsthanderwerker der englischen Renaissance (A. Munday) II. — **Id.** 150, 3/4 (August 1926). A. Brandl, Fouqué und Landor. — Max Förster, Datierung und Charakter des kymrisch-englischen Marien-Hymnus (important for students of the history of English sounds). — H. Marcus, Besuche bei Irischen dichtern. — Notes, Reviews, and Short Notices.

**Germ.-Rom. Monatsschrift.** XIV, 3/4. (March–April 1926). Includes Walter Fischer, Der demokratische gedanke in der neueren amerikanischen Literatur. — **Id.** 5/6 (May–June 1926). Includes Ph. Aronstein, Samuel Butler d. J. I. — **Id.** 7/8 (July–Aug. 1926). Includes Ph. Aronstein, Samuel Butler d. J. II.